Book 3

[originally published as Book 22 of the Serial *Völkisches Erwachen*/*Folkish Awakening*]

Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification

Introduction

First Things: The Method!

Again, I present to the German people a new work, whose subject, as in all my previous historical-critical works – 1. The Falsification of German History, 2. New Evidence for the Falsification of German History, 3. The Historical Mysteries of the World, 4. Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages, all published by Adolf Klein Publishers, Leipzig – is that great falsification action carried out at the end of the Middle Ages by Rome, and its consequences. This new Book now continues tightly connected to the previous Book 2, *Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages*, so that, in order to gain an understanding of what is about to be presented, the study of Book 2 is prerequisite. Some critics put it to me, that my investigations completely leave to desire the positive side, the constructiveness. Here we go: in the following chapters, one will, with satisfaction, meet a whole range of positive results! Since almost over five-hundred years, namely since that falsification action, we will again find out, for the first time, what the history of the closing Middle Ages in its basic shape really looked like. A critical-historical investigation cannot come out any more positively at all. Besides, the still following books, too, will offer *positive contributions to the critical history of the closing Middle Ages*.

The soul of any critical examination is the *method* which it is applying. Only he who works methodically, works scientifically, thus goes an old truism. It is the method that is crucial. Why has previous historical research been wasting its labour, and why has it, despite honest efforts, never penetrated through to the truth of medieval history? Only because the historians have previously worked with the equipment of a well insufficient method. Sure, *they* call their method a critical one; but in reality, as I have proven, with regards to the objective of historical truth, their scientific modus operandi represents a most innocent and pseudo-critical procedure. With their inherited method, which is a relativistic one, the historical researchers cannot exactly achieve what must yet, after all, be unconditionally crucial with historical investigations: to ascertain the truth. It lies in the nature of the subject, that only the by me established *absolute* method can bring to light the historical truth.

In the chapters of this Book, too, the absolute method is being applied again and again. Therefore, I would like to once again demonstrate its nature by a practical example. Let us take the following "case of tragedy" of a child in Hamburg, which is handed down to us in *Pitaval der Gegenwart* [*Crime Stories of the Present*], vol. 2 (1906), p 181/182. The mother has witnessed the tragedy, and reports on it: "When the men and I had separated, I carried on walking with the boy. In the …street, I became unwell, and returned; the boy was complaining about fatigue. I was leaning against the railing of the bridge. The boy, in the meantime, was

climbing onto the bridge railing. Then, the two men returned again. They were being foolish, and started pushing each other. During this, the boy received a knock, and fell into the water. I wanted to reach for the boy, but I couldn't grab him anymore. The men took me with them, and said there was already one down there to get the boy back up. In Hamburg, I stayed three days, and then returned to … . In Hamburg, I did not say anything about my son's tragedy. To my brother's question I said that the boy was still with his grandparents… I told my parents that I put the boy out to people who had travelled away…" – What will the male reader – he doesn't have to be a father himself - , what will the female reader – she doesn't have to be a mother – say to this description? Even if reports of "both men" and other witnesses were presented, *concurring* with this description – what will be said of this "tradition"? That this description is a *lie*! Why? Because on the basis of the psychological axiom of a mother's love for her child[l], the event in the described way is *impossible*. From this axiom, it follows with absolute certainty, that in reality, the event must have unfolded differently; and then later, the dehumanised mother has eventually confessed that she had deliberately pushed her son into the water in order to get rid of him.

However, what the critical reader has just put into operation during the assessment of the handed-down event, is – in the historical-critical realm – nothing other than the by me into the historical science introduced absolute method. Its nature consists of: not relativistically measuring up the handed-down by the tradition itself, but to acquire one's critical yardstick from the living experience. The relativistic researchers could counter that they, too, had already occasionally operated with this method. Quite right, *occasionally*, and with regards to historical trifles, they, too, apply the absolute yardstick. For one, I Haller[l] says so: "One must insist yet, that reports or word interpretations, which want to make us believe things that are impossible by the nature of things, are to be rejected as a matter of principle." These are golden words, taken straight from my heart. Only, our historians must of course be serious about the consequent use of the absolute method. And only then is one serious, when one measures not only occasionally and in trifles, but *principally* the entire tradition, i.e. as a whole, and especially in its main and state affairs, with the critical yardstick of the living experience. So, this is the demand I am addressing to the historians: be serious with your critique! Rise up from the trifles to the great historical mountain ranges! And then, for the final assessment, step out of your paper tradition by appealing to experience as the highest judge over the truth in history.

[l] Orig. 'Kindesliebe', literally 'childlove'

1. The lie of the origin of the big schism of the church

Mentally, we step before a mighty range of the tradition of the late medieval history: before the complex of the alleged *schism of the universal church*. Our task is now to establish by critical investigation, whether the foundation material of this tradition of the schism (split of the universal church) really consists of the granite rock of real history, or completely or partially of artificial paper products of the falsification. As being useful, we first innocently listen to what "history" has to tell about the schism, with a focus of our attention on the main event, the *origin* of the church split.

In the year 1378, the election of a new pope allegedly took place in Rome, the capital city of Christianity. Elected was, under all sorts of tumultuous and tragicomical circumstances, the archbishop of Bari, Bartholomew of Prignano. This occurred on the 8th April of the year. A few months later, on 20th September 1378, the very same electors now, the cardinals, elected a new pope. What? Has the in April elected – he assumed the name Urban VI. – died so quickly? No, pope Urban VI. still lived and reigned when the cardinals lifted the new head of church, Clemens VII., onto the clerical throne. So, instead of one pope, Christianity had all of a sudden *two* supreme herders; and in the same way those two fought each other bitterly as rivals, so, too, the christian herd fell apart into two hostile groups. The great church split, the schism, was there.

If we now ask: who is to blame for the split of popedom and the church?, nobody will hesitate for long with an answer. Everybody will shout: the electors, the cardinals, are to blame. And the historians have to report a root cause for the cardinals' conspicuous way to act, too, or much rather, two or three and more root causes and reasons, respectively. Consider, one explains to us, that popedom had just returned from its "captivity" from Avignon to Rome, and that of the sixteen cardinals present to Rome at Urban VI.'s election, eleven were Frenchmen. These French electors naturally wanted to elect a French pope; but they were pushed, nay, almost forced, on behalf of the Romans, to elect a Roman or at least an Italian to the head of church, and only as a result of the threats did it happen that the electors' votes united in favour of the Italian Urban VI. Is it any wonder, the researchers reckon, that especially the French cardinals – when an opportunity arose – abandoned Urban VI., and now hastily nominated a pope who was suitable to them, namely the Frenchman Clemens VII.? Rivalry from national roots seems to thus sufficiently explain the actions of at least the French electors. 'Seems to explain', I put it this way for a reason; and there are relativistic researchers as well, who are not satisfied with that explanation. Because it has to be mentioned that even the *Italian* members of the cardinals' college agreed to the election of the French counter-pope! At this point, the reader, too, will sense that there are psychological problems here; the behaviour of *all* cardinals becomes mysterious and wanting an explanation. How much their actions are screaming for an explanation, is also revealed to us by the consideration that the cardinals, by their second election, *consciously* brought upon Christianity the greatest nuisance, the schism. How did they arrive at this move? Who is to blame? Who has brought the great

misfortune of the schism over church and Christianity? The blame lies with Urban VI.!, many historians now shout, too. Urban VI. is the real originator of the church split! But how and why? With this question, we step onto the pivot point of the root cause of the schism, we step into the psychological sphere of pope Urban VI.

As a church Prince and a human being, who was Urban, and what was he made of? Urban, Bartholomew of Prignano by name, before his election, was archbishop and vice chancellor of the church. With regards to his mental attributes, he was considered an irreproachable, learned and cautious, clever man. He was well-known to all cardinals, well-received by all. Of course, one could have, even under the alleged force of the Romans, handed the pope crown to another Italian, but no, none was found by the cardinals to be more dignified for the high office, than the modest and clever Prignano. And then, only a few months after his election, the great turnaround, Urban's abandonment by all cardinals, the election of the counter-pope. What had happened? To put it in a few short words: the before the election so cautious and modest Prignano turned out to be – the papal tiara had barely touched his parting – a mentally and characterly totally changed being. Where he was modest previously, he was now arrogant, loutish and insulting; previously clever and cautious, he now behaved like an irresponsible dumbhead. Remarkable, but true – thus, Urban's contemporaries reassure us, according to source reports. We now want to once hear something more detailed about Urban's metamorphosis.

"As early as the first day after his coronation… he insulted many bishops and prelates… It sure was not the right way to improve the secularised cardinals, when Urban, in the consistory, had some harshly shut up, and shouted at others: 'Thou talketh foolishly!', and when he called the cardinal Orsini a dumbhead."[2] Urban did indeed have all cause to be in commotion over the morals of the cardinals, we are assured, "only the kind and way he tackled the issue, was completely ill-suited. Instead of proceeding with cleverness and modesty…, he let himself get carried away with the passion of his temperament in such a way, that his already insecure position as such was most endangered in no time at all." (P., p 99) Indeed, if we have a look at this lout, he behaves towards his "brothers", the cardinals, as if he stood as an irritated teacher before unruly school boys. Some researchers reckon that psychologically, Urban's behaviour is not at all that unintelligible. Before the election, Prignano stood *below* the cardinals in rank and reputation, so he had to keep his temper in check, and put on the show of modesty for those above. However, after his mounting the throne, Urban threw off the mask of humility, and now the upstart indulged in letting the cardinals feel his power and superiority.

Why, if Urban had played the loutish teacher and gall-bitter tyrant only towards his *cardinals*! But we hear of some quite different, scandalous appearances yet. Not before cardinals and bishops, but before high and highest *secular* masters! "As proof of Urban's pathological (!) arrogance, Dietrich of Niem (an eye witness) refers to the fact that he let Duke Otto of Braunschweig, the husband of the Queen of Naples, who had come to Rome with great gifts of his wife, and who, at the papal table, took on the office of the cup-bearer, lie on his knees for long, before he took the wine cup offered to him. He also insulted Queen Joanna herself… by reprimanding her regimen. Why, he even threatened to stick her in a convent."[3] Another

example: the German Emperor Charles IV. had delegated an important legation to Rome. "The pope, after his coronation, like intoxicated by the feeling of power that had suddenly fallen upon him, treated the Imperial legates (whom he had previously received very graciously) with the same abruptness and disdain as the cardinals."[4] Really, it was exactly as one historian writes: "The pope no longer seemed to understand anything… all present were deeply insulted by these personal attacks, and the pope's supporters, who felt how much cleverness it would take in his precarious situation, had no explanation for this careless behaviour."[5] Of this clerical super-herder, one has the impression, as if he was consciously intent on forcefully making all the world his enemy. He snubs, injures and insults anybody who gets before his eyes. There can be no talk of considering the potential consequences of such childish behaviour with this arrogant Tartar. But that means: after his coronation, Urban has not only become unbearably arrogant, but also endlessly *dumb*! Before his election, his uncommon cautiousness and cleverness are glorifyingly mentioned, after, in his his already precarious situation as such, he behaves like a silly boy.

If the source statements are right, we thus stand before the fact that after his election, Urban has mentally and characterly changed to the core of his nature. Is such change in the nature of a human being possible? Is it equally possible as an overnight change? The thoughtful reader will now perhaps, with a practical example of their experience in mind, reply: such a mental change is possible. And I will not deny it, either. However, what I deny – that is, also on the basis of experience – is, that such total out-of-the-blue change can take place *with a mentally sound* human being. And indeed, Urban VI.'s mental health must have suffered much, if it were true that after ascending the throne, he had all of a sudden characterly-mentally changed into his opposite. Note well: Urban's childish actions are not those of a private person, some odd guy, who could get away with insulting and tyrannising his fellow humans. Urban is the head of a clerical state body, and each of his actions and statements are potentially liable to bring about unforeseeable consequences for his position and the church. To highlight just one: in Italy, Naples was the most powerful and most vital support of popedom – yet, Urban falls out with Naples, and that purely from a bitter whim and pathological arrogance. A person in Urban's high official position, who suddenly acts systematically *against* his own advantage, who does not act like a silly boy for fun, but in all sincerity, must have suffered severe damage in their mental intactness. And so, Gregorovius reckons straight out: "His sudden elevation to popedom filled this raw human being with sense-bewildering arrogance, and in truth, it seems to have cost him his sanity."[6]

To what verdict are we to come on this sudden, total change in nature of Urban? Going by experience, such metamorphosis is not impossible. On the other hand however, it is certain by experience that the sudden turn-around of a so far modest, sociable and clever man into his opposite is possible only on the basis of a mental illness. In this not exactly everyday case we are permitted to believe only if the *tradition* about it is unobjectionable, that is primarily, if it is free from contradictions. And now I have prepared the big surprise for the reader. Namely, now comes the to my previous readers so well-known "other side" of the tradition.

By no means has Bartholomew Prignano gone insane; by no means has, after his coronation, all cleverness evaporated from his brain! Yet, if we do probe the sources, we will with bewilderment find out that this Urban, even after his promotion, knew how to cleverly assert his advantage! But for now, it may be pointed out that there was nothing noticeable in the way of a mental illness with Urban inasmuch as he – besides his attacks against the cardinals – saw to his papal duties reasonably and quite according to regulation. Something else remarkable: if we did not know by an "eye witness", how contemptibly the pope had treated his cardinals at any opportunity, we would have to, from differing sources, come to the conclusion that first after his coronation – when he was allegedly so "crazy"! – Urban was, to the contrary, on the best of terms with the cardinals. Because "going by the records", it is "certain": the cardinals "have given gifts to him [the pope; K.] most abundantly, and shown him marks of respect of all kinds, they asked and received from him (!) bishoprics and other honorary positions for themselves and others, nowhere was there a trace of discord."[7] Oh, such jesters, these sources! With regards to Naples, too, we now experience the "other side". "Back then [after Urbans's election; K.], Niccolo Spinelli, the… chancellor of Joanna as well as Honorat of Fondi were also present in Rome by chance… But with them, too, the [Urban's; K.] relations were at the beginning (!) friendly (!); why, the contemporaries even stress that the new pope had gathered around him especially Neapolitans, and helped them to honorary positions."[8] M Rothbarth, to whom we owe a thorough examination of Urban's relations with Naples, continues: "All the more amazing is it when other sources (!)… declare Niccolo Spinelli Urban's open enemy from the beginning." What appears so amazing to the author here, the readers of my previous works can effortlessly explain: tactics of the deliberate contradiction. So, should the sources on the origin of the schism be *forged*? No doubt, they *are* forged! Rothbarth herself arrives at that result. The sources contain "fabulous reports and anecdotes", from which clearly the purpose emanates, with regards to Naples, "to declare the abandonment of Urban from a personal feeling of revenge."

If we now summarise the "other side", we stand before a very amazing fact indeed: Urban has not at all gone insane from arrogance as a result of his election! Much rather, as a pope, too, Urban was a friendly, sociable man, who did not lose track of his own advantage, either. Neither the Neapolitan masters, nor even the cardinals, has he treated and insulted like a madman. But then, the cardinals had no cause at all to abandon Urban! *And then, they had no cause to elect a counter-pope!! Why, then, the entire tradition complex on the origin of the schism is a web of lies*! And indeed, so it is. The alleged schism of the "universal church" is a bare-faced lie. Urban VI.'s remarkable change of nature is a well-calculated lie of the falsification action, in order to feign the rise of a split of the universal church. To all of the readers of my previous book *Mystery Rome*, this result does not come as a surprise. They much rather see with satisfaction, how in a long chain of evidence, one link accurately connects to the next. In the void of Rome, the alleged Urban confusion could not at all have taken place, and the universal church could not at all experience a split for the simple reason that back then, a catholic universal church did not even exist.

What? Then, is the entire tradition around Urban VI. a bare-faced lie? No! A split of Christianity really existed! I say: *existed*! A schism does not need to be brought on by Urban, because it existed already, it had already existed for over fifty years! Only this split did not concern the "universal church". But more detail in the following chapter.

2. The problem of the existence of medieval regional churches

The result of the examinations of the previous chapter was this: the alleged split of the catholic universal church – allegedly as a result of the behaviour of pope Urban VI. – is lies. Already many decades before Urban VI., Christianity shows a split, or much rather, *numerous splits*. I deliberately talk of splits of Christianity, not of the "church", because a unified catholic overall church had not yet existed before the 15th century. From the start, the inconsistency, the being split, was the characteristic sign of Christendom. How this is to be understood, the examinations of the following chapters shall show to us. At this point already, however, be the result anticipated: the original state of the christian European world around the year 1300 was characterised by an *independent co-existence of a whole number of "evangelical" regional and national churches, respectively*!

What? Independent, Rome-free, mutually sharply distinguished regional churches are supposed to have existed in the Middle Ages? "We have", say our historians, "never read of such churches in the many sources." And right they are; because in the falsified sources, there is no free and open chatter of medieval evangelical regional churches. Why, the sources were systematically disfigured just with the express purpose of veiling the fact of these churches before posterity. However, there are ways and means now, to prompt the lying sources to reveal historical truth at least in its general outline. How to proceed to that effect, will soon be shown.

With the right treatment, the *Heretics' history* can give us a first hint, and with it, a series of striking proofs for the existence of medieval regional churches. Several problems of this so-called Heretic's history, I have already dealt with in *Mystery Rome*, and in the following, in some places, those examinations will be referenced, often without explicitly saying so.

Just how actually, according to the description of the falsified tradition, did the seed of "heresy" come into the late medieval world? In "history", let us once switch gear to backwards. There, even the trimmed sources concede for the first half of the 15th century a temporary existence of a Rome-free, almost exclusive

"evangelical" regional church: *the Hussite church in Bohemia*. This was indeed not simply a *schismatic* phenomenon *within* the catholic church, but an independent, Rome-free Heretics' church, i.e. an "evangelical" regional church. As the founder of this Heretics' church, we know *Hus*. How did this Hus get to his heresies? Via an own thought process on the basis of his own religious experience? Not at all; but, as he says it at the Konstanz council himself, by the reading of books that had been imported from England to Bohemia. Those were *Wycliffe's* heretic writings. Hus has taken on his teachings from Wycliffe, that is, for the largest part, he has simply copied from Wycliffe.[9] So, then Wycliffe was the father of late medieval heretic views? But whoever is only a little familiar with the Heretics' history knows that even the Englishman was not at all the first proclaimer of the accusations against the "of the gospel" apostatized Roman hierarchy, but that he, too, had predecessors. Of what Wycliffe accused the "Rome church", his anger against the Roman "devil's priests"[II], all these to us are – with the exception of his taking issue with the transubstantiation doctrine – well-known noises from Waldensedom. Of these Waldensians however, we know that their heretic teachings, too, were by no means new, own discoveries, but that these "Poor of Lyon and Lombardy" had merely taken on the inheritance of the suddenly so mysteriously of religious old age extinct Cathars. So, it was the Cathars, who since around the 12th century, in the pure-of-belief, "catholic universal church" first spread the seed of heresy? *Spread* the seed in the unified occidental church, is indeed what the Cathars have done, the sources report. But it is not domestic, it is *foreign* produce they spread about in the pure church. Because not in the lap of the Rome church itself did the heresy pest supposedly originate, but it had supposedly been wickedly dragged in from far Eastern lands. Namely, in Bulgaria, of all places, and the adjacent regions, had the heretic seed first sprung up, the sources report. Now we know it. A foreign poisonous growth has been sown on the previously pure field of the "Roman-catholic church". Had not those foreign tempters and seducers come, the pure universal church, in its wonderful strength of faith, could have never sprouted the seed of heresy from itself!

Really never? But the sources picture the origin of the medieval heresy as just described, so, the affair with the heresy will probably have happened like that. But the sources on the Heretics' history are forged! Are forged thoroughly and systematically, as I have already revealed in *Mystery Rome*. Now, it does not require much contemplating at all, to find out why the falsification action has presented the Heretics' affair, why it *had to* present it, as if the seed of heresy were something dragged in from far off. Because this is why they proceeded in that manner: *in order to make the catholic universal church appear as a, from the oldest days (!) existing, homogeneous faith community*. However, with this pretended *unity* of the universal church, back then, at the same time, something very important had been wiped off the blackboard of history: that in the Middle Ages, in truth, no faith-homogeneous universal church even existed, but only numerous "Heretic" regional or particular churches. It is obvious that this true state of affairs had to be covered up. As already mentioned, I had already stepped up to prove the systematic falsification of the Heretics' history in the

[II] What a perfectly accurate description…

previous Book; only one important piece of evidence, I had not yet mentioned back then. Since its arguments work unconditionally penetrating and convincing, I will now briefly introduce the new complex of evidence, before we again move over to the actual subject of the regional churches.

He who takes a look at the sources of the Heretics' history, must immediately be struck by one thing: there may be large amounts of source material preserved, but they *have been, without exception, written by the opposition, i.e. the catholic side*! What does that mean? Have the Heretics (Cathars and Waldensians) not written anything on paper themselves? "Oh yes", the historians as well tell us, and of the Cathars, even the opposition reports that they had written much.[10] So, even the relativistic researchers have arrived at the conviction: the fact that only catholic sources are preserved for us, means that the heretic literature has been systematically and completely *destroyed*. With this, we admits that a systematic destruction action has taken place. Only, we has not yet been contemplating, how much and just actually what of the written material of the Heretics has been destroyed. The Heretics have for example composed and distributed religious tractates and advertising writings; and it makes no wonder now, that the inquisition destroyed such literature. But let us think for a moment: have the Heretics written nothing else except religious advertisement literature? They were organised, had offices and institutions – they had their own public schools and church yards – and surely had to therefore, pressed by necessity, fix in writing all sorts of ongoings in the community life. Thus, records had to accumulate in many places. Conspicuously however, these records, too, have vanished! This finding is most strange. Because what reason did the persecutors have for also destroying these records down to the last sheet? We could counter, that with this, the inquisition had the intent of hiding any trace at all of the medieval "Hereticdom" before the eyes of the co-world and posterity. But that is not true. The catholic opponents were by no means intent on silencing the existence of the Heretics before posterity; to the contrary, *they themselves* have, in oodles of *own* writings and tractates, provided copious news on Hereticdom for posterity. I therefore ask now once more: then, why have even the innocent records on the community affairs of the Heretics been completely destroyed? Striking is of course that absolutely none of them have been preserved at all, whereas else since the 12th century, so much "useless lumber of records" has come down upon us. Most noteworthy also, that the great heretic record *content* has not even been *indirectly* utilised by the opponents, and thus at least been saved indirectly. Such records must have yet abundantly fallen into the hands of the inquisition. But strange, whatever the catholic authors report, they do *not* take from the records of the Heretics, but they allegedly have the prisoners tell them orally! (Smart tactics of the falsifying catholic opponents.)

Next: surely, the Heretics have also made and preserved *chronicle-like* records of their important sect events. Where have these heretic chronicles gone? They have altogether (!) vanished! Then, why that? Of course, there were good reasons for the inquisitors to render harmless the heretic advertisement literature, if it was written in the country's language. But why should the opponents have so hatefully tracked down and destroyed the chronicles of heretic authors written in Latin or even in the people's language, if – yes, if *they themselves* most willingly provided chronicles and other literature on the alleged development and teachings

of this very Hereticdom to the co-world and posterity? So far, no researcher has racked their brains on this so important problem, and yet, it is really worth it. Under careful consideration of all tell-tale circumstances – e.g. that the allegedly contemporary catholic authors, one and all, painfully avoided throughout several centuries to even indirectly utilise the heretic chronicles and records; that furthermore, in the preserved scripts of the catholic reporters, the main tactics of the great falsification action, namely the deliberate contradiction, is deployed so carelessly – the relativistic researchers, too, would gain the insight, that the entire heretic literature has been systematically destroyed with the express intent of equally systematically inserting something else in the gap. By these considerations, we would recognise that simply, not only was there something being destroyed, but something *new* was also created, that is, something new was *forged*, and inserted for allegedly genuine in the place of the destroyed. The systematic eradication of all heretic and authentic records and chronicles becomes intelligible only by the realisation: *forged substitutes were meant to step in the place of the destroyed originals*. Or, viewed from a different perspective: in order to foist upon posterity a new Heretics' history in the "historical" outfit, just as the purpose required, there was one prerequisite to be fulfilled on the part of the forgers of the great action, namely the complete destruction of *all* existing *genuine* heretic records and chronicles. For the fact of the eradication of *all* genuine heretic literature, there is simply no other reason to be found than this one: forged [material] was meant to be slipped in the gap.

In order to not digress all too far, I will at this point content myself with the remark, that naturally, the so numerously preserved "official" trial records of the inquisition tribunals, inasmuch as they fall in a time from before around 1400, have also been falsified. One simple consideration, by the way, already establishes this result with certainty. When during the course of the falsification action, they put forged substitute material in the place of the destroyed original heretic literature, the nature of the issue – namely the pursued purpose of the artificial Heretics' history – demanded that *complete* work would be performed. It was not possible to leave alive authentic material in any form whatsoever (e.g. in the trial records of the inquisition), which had to become a traitor to the falsified material. If they were to create a harmony between all *purposeful* information on the Heretics, their teachings and institutions – and they were forced to do so – there was nothing else left but to falsify the trial records in a way that their statements *concurred* with the chronicle-like forgery products, at least in the basic outline.

It is time now that we return to our actual subject, the problem of the existence of medieval particular churches.

Does the falsified tradition not give us, as the researchers reckon, any clue whatever, no hidden hint at the existence of such regional churches? Let us see. But first, I have to once again highlight the characteristic attributes, the peculiarities of these churches and communities, respectively. So, with these regional and particular churches, we are dealing with christian organisations, who 1. are independent of Rome, i.e. who do not represent partial pieces of the catholic universal church, 2. who are also mutually independent entities. Not for nothing have we previously concerned ourselves with the Heretics' history. Because the Heretics' history,

it has been stressed once before, is an area of tradition, which offers good returns for the solution of our problem.

The momentum of the regional separation and distinction that characterises the sought after Rome-free communities, is involuntarily admitted by the falsified tradition itself. By the fact that it lets shimmer through *regional group formations, geographical accumulations* of "heretic" organisations. E.g., we hear there of a *mass-like* existence of the "Evangelicals" in Southern France (Poor of Lyon) and in Upper Italy (Poor of Lombardy). Significantly, these accumulations do not represent a brief, temporary state, but we perceive in these regions a mass occurrence that lasts for centuries. First, it is the Cathars, then the Waldensians, who, in the same regions, are conspicuous because of their accumulation. The down-to-Earth and regional restriction elements of these French and Italian "Heretics" becomes even more apparent, when we realise that basically, Waldensians and Cathars are one and the same thing! Such century-long lasting heretic centres are betraying to us an original state of affairs: there were regionally limited Rome-free heretic communities. Elsewhere, do we find them, too? Indeed, such accumulations can also be proven, and also with century-long existence, for Southern and Western Germany, for slightly later times in England, Bohemia and Austria. We have thus already discovered a regional division and separation of the late medieval "heretic" Christendom. Only of the heretic Christendom?

The following interjection on the part of the historians is now near at hand. Large areas from the tradition are known to the researchers, which allegedly, in the Middle Ages, showed very few, even no "Heretics" at all. However, we want to, as will turn out momentarily, deliver proof via our examinations not only for the fact, that in the Middle Ages, here and there sporadic Rome-free organisations (churches) existed, but eventually for the fact that *only* Rome-free regional churches existed anyhow, *that therefore back then, there could not have been any talk of a "catholic universal church"*. (That really, before the 15th century, no catholic universal church existed, is something my readers, by the way, already know from *Mystery Rome*.) But what now? According to the tradition, there were supposedly vast Heretic-free lands. But surely, back then, human beings will have lived in those areas; and if they were no Heretics, then, they surely must have been loyal sons and daughters of the catholic universal church, which, however, according to our knowledge, could not even have existed at that time. Again now, the falsified tradition itself involuntarily plays the traitor and revealer, and it does it by the fact that it operates with the trusty tactics of the deliberate contradiction. Finke[11] establishes for Westphalia, that as late as the 13th and 14th century, he finds in the sources "no trace of a spread of heresy". "But in the year 1413, Jacob of Soest appoints his order associate John of Lüdighausen his stand-in in the area of the Westphalian diocese, because heresy was strongly (!) raging there." Then, however, Finke continues: "In striking contrast to that stands Peter of Pilichdorf's claim in his probably not two decades later created script…, that Westphalia is supposedly not at all infected with this heresy [of the Waldensians; K.], and we may well add, not with heresy as such." Or let us take the pre-Hussite Bohemia.

There, *one* source reports, the number of Waldensians in Bohemia and Moravia is supposedly not countable; but *another* one knows better and announces: of Heretics, there is supposedly no trace to be found![12]

Why these contradiction tactics? Because there was something to be covered up; naturally, nothing pleasant, but something embarrassing was to be covered up. And this embarrassing thing was the fact that in truth, many, very many more Heretics existed in the Middle Ages than the trimmed sources admit to – and they already admit to much! In connection with this, I have to remind of my deliberations in *Mystery Rome* on the *monstrous spread* of the late medieval heresy, that is, of the central problem of the entire Heretics' history. The final result there was: a powerful universal church, if such thing did indeed exist, rules such monstrous spread of heresy out; vice versa, the by the sources themselves admitted abundance of Heretics testifies with the weight of evidence *against* the existence of a catholic universal church back then. But if the universal church was not yet there, so follows, that at that time, *no Christian at all could have yet been a member of this not existing universal church*! This means nothing else than: all Christians of that time were Rome-free Heretics! In the sense of the only *later* – with the formation of the catholic universal church – formulated catholic dogmas, previously, *all* Christians were indeed Heretics. It was this embarrassing fact that the source falsifiers had to cover up.

By again shifting back to the subject: medieval regional churches, we now inspect the tradition for the aspect, whether it perhaps lets shimmer through some things about an organisation of the "heretic" churches. That is indeed the case. There, we find out interesting and remarkable things about the organisation of the Heretics: they thus supposedly had their own, i.e. heretic bishops! Of such a heretic bishop in Austria, we hear by the so-called Passau Anonymous. (H. 5 I, p 399) Hauck reports of the Waldensian Bohemians of the 14th century: "One supposedly knew that they… had an archbishop and seven bishops" (ibid, p 403), and also mentions the seat of a Waldensian bishop in the South of Germany. (ibid, p 398) "In Lombers [Southern France; K.], resided publicly a heretic bishop."[13] Flathe points out the late medieval chronicler Everwein of Steinfeld, who recounts: "Heretics, condemned to the fire, had supposedly still confessed to him, that they also had a pope (!)."[14] To us, it comes out remarkable that the heretic accumulations – the regional churches of the Heretics – were boasting an organisation, which in part, was thoroughly developed, and has then even progressed to a tight *hierarchy*. Not this hierarchy as such is of importance to us, but the *conclusion* that follows from the existence of such a tight clerical administration machinery. Namely, from the existence of such a well-defined hierarchy, it follows that indeed "heretic" regional churches as the bottom foundation of the hierarchy must have existed. A thus defined administration organisation can of course not float in mid air, but it constitutes a broad and strengthened basis of followers and faith companions. Both parts, however – the basis of the faith companions, and hierarchical superstructure – then form the by us sought, and now established, fact of medieval heretic regional churches.

To the nature of such regional churches belongs also the momentum of the *publicity*, because we do not perhaps consider them hidden conventicle communities. The reader will have to free themselves from the

inherited view, that the medieval "Heretics" of those centuries, *before* the formation of the catholic universal church, would have had to congregate for God worship in hideouts. After all, a catholic unified church, from whose inquisitors the Heretics would have had to hide, did not even exist! Just the *publicity* of the allegedly heretic God service speaks very clearly against the existence of the catholic universal church. But then, was the religious life of the Heretics as well really public, obvious? Even if the sources were not giving away anything to us on this, then some thinking should suffice yet in order to realise the publicity: a regionally accumulated *numerous* community which possesses a developed hierarchy, can only exist obviously, visibly before all of the world, or – not exist at all. The secrecy fails simply by the *volume*. To top it off, we find in the sources the confirmation for the publicity. "A German inquisitor notifies us, that in Lombardy, the Provence and other regions, there were more Heretics' schools with more pupils than schools of the right faith theology, that they disputed publicly, and encouraged the people to public discussions… They were… properly organised in dioceses (!)." (L I, p 141) Apart from the fact that *before* the 15th century, there were no inquisitors of the *catholic superchurch*, we hear something historically true from the sources here. "heresy" was an affair of the broadest publicity, i.e. it existed in the form of well-organised, very much public regional churches. By the way, how much the sources are twisting and bending also with regards to the question of the heretic organisation, we can for example find out from the "contemporary" Moneta. He has handed down to us the amazing news, that with the Waldensians on the one hand, there existed "the three-fold division of the clerical office [deacon, presbytarian, bishop; K] as a demand (!) of the sect", but at the same time on the other hand, "presumes in this, that it nonetheless did not have those positions (!!)."[15]

So, "heretic" regional churches have existed in the Middle Ages; on the basis of our conduct of evidence so far, this fact can no longer be doubted. We even know more details: since before the 15th century, no catholic universal church had existed yet, there can have existed, up to then, *per se only* heretic, i.e. Rome-free particular churches.

Some additional proofs for the already established fact of the heretic regional churches shall conclude this chapter.

That on the verge of modern times, *Bohemia* had a separate "evangelical" regional or national church, respectively, the tradition confesses itself, albeit pressed by necessity, because it could really not be covered up. Only, the sources disfigure the facts of the matter to the effect that this heretic church had only very recently *abandoned* the great, unified, catholic universal church by the influence of the reformer Hus. In truth, the Bohemian heretic regional church as such had existed *for a long time*. Hus has not created anything new, but only continued something old.

How does it stand with England? Here, the sources report, that also a reformer, Wycliffe, had undertaken the attempt of separating the English Christians from the association of the "universal church", and *founding* a Rome-free heretic national church. Again, the affair is being turned upside down by oracling

something of an "abandonment" of the universal church by the English. Even if a contemporary English chronicler recounts, "that the sects of the Wycliffites and the Lollards… had won for themselves half of the volk or even the majority"[16], the truth shimmers through only murkily. Because before the 15th century, even in England, there could not have been any followers of the not yet existing Roman great church, but he/she who was a Christian at all back then, was a "Heretic". Interesting is the following mysterious detail from a German contemporary. In the chronicle of Henry of Diessenhoven, who supposedly died in 1376, this author recounts quite in passing of an "old prophecy", namely: in the year 1350, there would be two popes, one in Rome and one in – London! The English pope would be the right one, and the Roman one the false one![17] This "prophecy" is no prophecy at all; it may reveal something, but not the future, but the past, i.e. the existence of a well-organised English *national church*, a *Rome-free* national church of course. Wycliffe, too, as already demonstrated above, has not created anything new, he, too, has merely re-modelled something already existing. Finally, he did not have to prod his English co-Christians to abandon the Rome church, because not *one* Christian back then was already "Roman-catholic".

And *Germany*? We have already heard of accumulations of Heretics in South-Western Germany, which in itself already points to firmly organised, publicly working regional churches. But the sources give away more secrets still. Listen and be amazed: in the 13th century, Germany was considered "generally filled up with Heretics. In each diocese, they had a bishop, to whom they attributed the name of the relevant catholic (!) holder of that post; they even claimed to possess a pope (!) whose name was Gregory, so that during an interrogation, they could swear that they shared the belief of the bishop and the [catholic; K.] pope Gregory." (L. II, p 375) We are dumbfounded and speechless over such wicked cleverness of the German "Heretics". In each diocese, they claim, they have, next to the catholic bishop, their own evangelical bishop! And what are the names of the heretic bishops? The same as the catholic ones!! On this, yet another interesting announcement. The "catholic" bishops should have been properly reprimanded for their "lukewarmness and clemency" against the Heretics! Were they conspiring with their evangelical colleagues? Or were they even identical with the heretic office colleagues!? Then, we would of course have the most beautiful proof for the existence of a medieval "heretic" German national church. We know that the sources here indeed give away something historically true; only, they have not quite stuck to the truth this time, either. In what way? In the following chapters, the reader will find clarification on this. Quite a few will no longer be able to hold back their interjection. This very obvious interjection is: if before the 15th century, no Roman universal church existed, then, no catholic inquisitors could yet persecute Heretics and have them burned before that time, either! Certainly not. If there was no catholic universal church, then, there were no Roman inquisitors. But, some reader now shouts, what in all the world could have driven the Roman-catholic fathers of the falsification action to stain their church with the blemish of persecuting and burning Heretics, if indeed *during those early times*, such persecution by the Roman church did *not* happen, and could not have happened? Surely, one does not so carelessly and unnecessarily soil their own nest. To this, I comment firstly: persecution and extermination of Heretics means – or should we say 'meant' – for the catholic Christian not

only *no* blemish, but quite to the contrary, a for God and "his" catholic church meritorious and glorious deed. Secondly: how else should the fathers of the falsification action represent the relations of the catholic universal church with the Heretics than they have done – namely, it goes without saying, as a *fight against* heresy – if they were forced by the general purpose of their history falsification, to lyingly claim the existence of the universal church "from the oldest days", and to "prove" it with falsified sources? In for a penny, in for a pound, and he who wants to falsify history, must falsify it so that his product at least *appears* historically genuine. Thirdly: nothing strengthens the appearance of the authenticity of a falsified tradition so extraordinarily as the tactics of the forgers do – to occasionally report of themselves or their cause, respectively, *something unfavourable with full deliberation*. And the fathers of the falsification action were very clever tacticians.

3. Particular dogma and dogma-free Christianity

Our investigation is concerned with the christian regional and national churches, whose historical existence we have recognised through the fog of the falsified tradition. I would like to point out explicitly, that in this Book, I will treat critically *only* the history of these churches from around the year 1300 on. What lies *before* 1300, has to temporarily remain disregarded, i.e. in this Book, too, for reasons previously and repeatedly explained by me. Numerous burning problems will only be discussed and solved in later publications.

What was the general clerical situation around the year 1300? Mutually exclusive "heretic", i.e. evangelical regional churches existed. A church-political entity, comprising and summarising these individual particular churches, a catholic universal church, did not yet exist. This finding is of monstrous importance. This will immediately become clear to us, if we now equally shift our attention to the internals of the regional churches, namely the faith teachings, the *dogma* of these medieval christian organisations. There is one important question emerging: how did things stand with the dogma of these individual churches? Did they possess a uniform, homogeneous structure of fundamental doctrines? Or were there differences in the dogmatic teachings of the individual regional organisations? Particular or universal dogma? It is necessary to contemplate this question long and thoroughly, but more than anything else, without prejudice.

What are dogmas? Dogmas are "statements, in which the religious basic truths are established, and which stem from divine revelation."[18] Dogmas apply "never to a view or teaching that is considered a mere opinion, but only to one that shall be called certain." These are thus "firm, unimpeachable, fundamental

statements of truth", which are "striving for validity". "Then, the church referenced the authority attributed to itself for having really and rightly taken their dogmas from that revelation laid down in the holy scripts." (Re. IV, p 734) There is talk here of the dogmas of *the* church per se, that is, of the universal, Roman-catholic overchurch. We know now however, that this catholic overall church had become a reality only at the beginning of the 15th century. We must therefore not make, the way the falsified tradition wants us to, a causal connection between the above statements of the nature and origin of the christian dogma and a, *before* the time around 1400 not even existing, superchurch. Short and sweet: the catholic universal dogma, *the way it exists around 1400*, stems by no means, not even in its basic shape, from the first centuries, but it stems from the last centuries of the Middle Ages! Sure, around the year 1300, the universal catholic dogma was a concept, but not a reality yet. Around the year 1300, many exclusive, evangelical particular churches existed, and when there is talk about the christian dogma around that time, then the dogma or dogmas of these regional churches are referred to.

On the basis of our investigations, we are now, with regards to the dogmatic problem, entitled and obliged to the conclusion: since, around the year 1300, no universal church and thus no universal-clerical dogma existed, what must have existed are particular dogmas of the individual regional churches. It thus follows that we have to also transfer the dogma formation into the sphere of the particular churches. Whenever, and if at all, dogmas have reached a development, then they must have sprouted as a *special produce* from the different kinds of fertile soil of these regional churches. Quite left to its own devices, the religious life within the individual churches had to create different kinds of denominations in terms of dogma formation. As much as different types of soil create different kinds of vegetation, so, the individual regional churches, too, had to give birth to different fundamental faith teachings, based upon the racial and volk-like peculiarity of their believers, *as long as their free growth was not violently disturbed from outside*. We will often get back to this point yet.

But surely, one interjects, the christian dogma formation unfolds on the one, equal in type, basis of the divine revelation, the way such is laid down in the holy script. One concludes: same revelation basis, same dogma formation. This conclusion, however, on closer examination of the state of affairs, turns out to be a bad error of judgement. Whoever is only fairly familiar with the divine "basis" of the dogmas, the bible, furthermore, whoever has only a little bit studied the psychological process of dogma formation, is by no means at all surprised by the fact that – depending on the "individuality" of the believer – the dogmatic results turn out differently. They *must* turn out differently. Why? For the simple reason, that the basis, the revelation, the bible, is *full of contradictions*![III] The bible is the most contradictive book in the world.[IV] The hl. script is like a jungle of religious-moral statements and demands; even the theologists get lost in it. What makes it a

[III] To say it with a Friedrich Schiller character from *Die Räuber*: "I can already smell the roast". Can you? The next volume, *The Falsification of the History of Primeval Christianity* will finally clarify.

[IV] Nothing like a snappy statement, is there? Not one letter too many in it. Tell a Christian.

peculiar and disastrous thing about the bible book is that this script never explicitly speaks out, just what actually is supposedly the undoubted will of God on this or that point. "To begin with, this script has no uniform teaching", says Harnack. (Ha. III [1890; K.], p 65, footnote 1) So, admittedly, this deep discrepancy of the bible does not merely apply to subordinate things of Christianity, but stretches into the very heart of the faith. If, however, things relevant to the basis of dogma formation stand thus, then, it cannot make any wonder that every attempt at chiselling out fundamental basic truths out of the contradictive conglomerate of the script, must arrive at different types of results. After all, everything rests on the [individual] human spirit, who ventures to re-forge the chaos of bible statements into the condensed form of a dogma.

Dogmas as such are not readily available in the bible; they have to first be designed out of the written material by human reason. "The dogmas are the produce of theology" (Ha. I, p 10), or, to put it more accurately: they are the produce of the *theologists*. Dogma production thus turns out to be very much a human affair, because after all, even theologists are only humans. One can still best study the process of dogma formation in the light of real history with Luther. Certainly, he did not by chance develop the thought: now you, too, shall find occupation as a dogma chiseller. The hard life, agitating religious-moral experiences threw Luther into the midst of the whirlpool of the dogmatic problem, in a manner of speaking. He then had to try and rescue himself by swimming, and the island on which he again found firm ground under his feet, was *his* dogma. How did Luther gain *his* dogma? By interpreting, i.e. putting into terms, his religious-moral *experiences*? No, but, on the basis of his experiences, interpreting something written, namely "God's written word", the bible, i.e. putting his slant on it, and condensing this interpretation to a few "fundamental truths". Christian dogma formation simply means interpretation of bible statements for the purpose of revealing the enormous content of the gospel in a few main statements. This process of selection and condensation requires sharpest reasoning work, and with each dogma formation of course, "the power of reason, the devil's little whore"[V], too, is strongly involved. The dogma has always something to do with the power of reason! Dogma is precipitation of christian power of reason; means rationalised Christianity condensed to a small core of truths. If one views Christianity through the lens of theology, instead of the gospel, one beholds – the dogma.

[V] An expression so gorgeously pointed and accurate (orig. 'Teufelshürlein Vernunft'); once you start realising the sheer scope, and of course truthfulness, of Kammeier's findings, you might start homing in on the 'click', the realisation that what you and I have been 'taught' about history has precious little to do with what actually happened (no need to go back to the Middle Ages; how about 'Covid', '9/11', any war, crisis etc. etc.?); the realisation that 'modern science' has also precious little to do with what it should be, and what's more, from where it stems originally (the Roman-catholic church, i.e. Jews); the realisation that we have been trained to unwittingly think (talmudically) that we, as individuals, are important, and what's more, that we are 'intelligent', and that we can therefore 'reason' anything we like, no matter *how* stupid, unnatural, and mostly harmful our activities are for ourselves individually and as the human species (intelligence: primarily, the notion of being able to successfully argue that the devil does not exist); and then some, for which there is not enough room here… That 'click' has plenty of potential to knock out the strongest man, and no mistake, but at least as much potential for comprehensive mental and spiritual liberation, too, if nothing else – welcome to the *practice*, *not theory*, of the old conspiracy.

It lies in the nature of a "dogma", that it does not want to lead a modest and singular existence as a mere viewpoint and individual opinion in the mind of its creator. Every dogma may first, after it has just been created by a theologist, be nothing but an individual viewpoint, an opinio[VI]. This opinio however, becomes a dogma if it can gain significance and blaze a trail on the outside of its creator. The possibility for this is given, if the opinio succeeds in revealing itself as a general truth, that is, according to its nature, as a *divine* general truth. So, what testimony can an opinion appearing as a dogma present to substantiate that its content be divine, obliging to the believers? There is a statement of one of the most celebrated dogmatists, the church father Augustin, and it is significant. We will by the way pay no attention to whether the scripts figuring under his name are even authentic. How has Augustin supposedly reconciled with the question of the divine truth of the dogma? Harnack airs the following on this: "The thousand doubts which the God doctrine and namely Christology arouses [oh vey, the dogma arouses doubts!; K.], may be appeased only by the church (!) [according to Augustin's opinion; K.] The church [thus, the theologists! thus, human beings!; K.] stands for the truth of the faith… Openly has he [Augustin; K.] proclaimed it: in many parts, I believe only on the authority (!) of the church; why, I even believe the gospel only on the authority of the church." (Ha. III, p 71) Now, this prominent confession is devastating for the character of the truthfulness of the dogma as such. Because according to this confession: a dogma is therefore divine truth, because theologists – the church! – declare it to be true! A dogma has to procure its certificate of truth by *external authority*! Not out of itself may the dogma acquire for itself significance; standing all by itself, the opinio would much rather remain individual viewpoint. The opinion can become a dogma only then, and by the fact that external authorities, human beings, declare them to be generally obliging divine central truth, and, if necessary, acquire respect by external means of power. The with "a thousand doubts" laden dogma does not have it easy to assert itself, history, that is, real history, proves that abundantly. "It is… inexorably clear", says a modern theologist, "that they [the dogmas; K.] have been asserted in a very human manner, by the aid of all horrors of church politics, and crucially, everywhere, by the aid of the political power that forces the fighting to stop."[19]

Now, we want to establish a connection between our knowledge of the origin and the nature of the christian dogma on the one hand, and the medieval particular churches on the other. We are, as has already been said above, *forced* to make this connection, because at the point in time that we are viewing – the year 1300 – a universal church did not yet exist. Is it even possible to make a statement on the general dogmatic situation within the regional churches around the year 1300? How should we know, what it looked like back then with regards to faith doctrines in the different particular churches? "The only possibility to find anything out about these things", the historians reply, "consists of consulting the sources on these things." So, very well, let us do that; but let us not forget that the potential sources are falsified.

Let us make it clear to ourselves, what is decisive in our investigation. Do we want to get to know the allegedly dogmatic doctrines of the catholic universal church for the time around 1300? No! Because a

[VI] Oh, now Kammeier is using Latin, so, it's 'opinio' instead of 'opinion', not a typo or keyboard issue.

catholic general church had not yet existed around 1300, and therefore, a catholic, i.e. a universal dogma cannot have existed at all, either. What we want to know is much rather the dogmatic situation in the *regional churches*. Does the tradition have an announcement on this affair? Indeed, it does report something, that is, it does it by making statements about the teachings of the medieval "Heretics". With this opportunity, we remind ourselves, that of course the alleged heretic churches in truth represented the back then existing christian churches as such. Now, what do the (falsified) sources announce about the faith doctrines of the different "heretic sects"?

We are not in the slightest amazed to hear, that the Heretics basically believed exactly the same what – the universal church believed! We are not at all amazed to learn from the falsified tradition: in many subordinate things, the Heretics may have been vehemently opposed against the catholic church, but on the main thing, namely the view of the dogmatic central truth, the Heretics had supposedly not moved an inch away from the "catholic" view. "At first glance, the opposition [of the Heretics against the catholic superchurch; K.] appears radical, yes, contradictory, there is cursing – antichrist, Babel, devils' church, devil's priests – flying through the air. However, if one looks closer, the opposition is then much tamer. That catholic fundamental principle of the church as the sacramental institution is not being contested." (Ha. III, p 408)

I say, we are by no means amazed over this representation of the dogma of the medieval "Heretics" that the tradition is dishing up for us. Because this is not genuine history talking here, but purposefully trimmed tradition. And then, how could the *falsified* tradition even present the dangerous dogmatic state of affairs of medieval "heresy" in any other way than it does? We know of course, the history of the Heretics has been systematically falsified from the ground up, after every trace of genuine history had been wiped out. Just how should it have occurred to the fathers of the action to tell the pure truth on the so important subject of "heretic" faith doctrines, of all things! And on the other hand, how admirably have they conducted their work of falsification! In many subordinate things, the Heretics may have opposed, but on the crucial point, the dogma, even the late medieval Heretics have not "abandoned" the catholic doctrine and church.

We stop here, we know enough. Or, much rather: we now know that the tradition, also with regards to the doctrines in the regional churches, is offering a filled sack of purposeful lies. My readers will have already anticipated this result.

In order to gain an insight into the dogmatic situation of the time around the year 1300, we must disregard the falsified tradition, and venture down different paths of insight. Let us contemplate whether, relevant to our subject, not perhaps some conclusions follow from the fact, that *several mutually independent* regional churches existed. Why then did *several* churches exist? That can only have had the very reason, that their faith teachings simply were of a *different kind*. With the different communities, different dogmas must have been valid. Had the regional churches represented faith doctrines in common, the dogma would have thus been a universal, generally valid one; with this, the churches would have necessarily given up their

individuality, and would have merged into an entity of a unified overall church. Why that? Because a unified dogma must inevitably create a *unified hierarchy*! With the moment of the merging of the individual particular dogmas, what must also form from the previously separated hierarchies of the particular churches, is a uniform clerical administration organism. It lies deep in the nature of the christian universal dogma, that it must not tolerate in its service several extra hierarchies *next to each other*. *One dogma – one hierarchy*! A uniform priesthood, however, means furthermore: a uniform church, a universal church! For our contemplation: particular or universal dogma of the individual regional churches?, it thus follows, that in the churches, a *different kind* of dogma must have been valid. Furthermore: *an extra hierarchy must have belonged to every church*.

Priesthood and dogma. It is necessary to have a closer look a both things. Dogma and priesthood – the terms and things behind these words are inseparably chained to each other. Without dogma, no hierarchy; no hierarchy without dogma! Both organisms are living in symbiosis. Without dogma and hierarchy however, there is no "church", either! What does it mean then: a community of believers has organised itself to a "church"? It means: the believers have created for themselves a "clerical" civil servantry, why, a hierarchy; they have founded a religious club, and in doing so, granted certain members certain privileges and powers. (In practice, the event can also take place reversed. On the basis of a dogma, a club board constitutes, who is then striving to recruit members.) Now, a "church" is not (only) about the administration of material things, but about ideal, religious issues and actions. Now, a religious "board", however, would be a superfluous institution, for as long as it were not *finding* to fulfil relevant religious (sacramental) official actions. But that means: a religious "board", a priesthood, a hierarchy, only steps up once an official basis has been created, when amongst the believers, there is a dogma developed that requires sacramental priest actions. Only from the dogmatic "certificate of appointment" can a hierarchy derive and justify the necessity of its existence. Once the dogma is only there, then the hierarchy comes up right after. On the other hand again, a with "divine authority" furnished hierarchy is unconditionally necessary in order to keep alive the per se so fragile dogma, to acquire for it any respect at all. Without an authoritative hierarchy, the dogma would soon sink to again become an opinio, a mere viewpoint. We know of course, the dogma, laden with "a thousand doubts", can only flourish in the medium of an "external" *authority*.

So, the one thing, we know for sure: the medieval regional churches have created and taught different types of dogmas; they must furthermore have had, each for itself, an extra hierarchy above itself.

When I now venture to partly limit the just formulated result again, such undertaking could arouse in the reader the impression, that the certainty of the result may not be all it is cooked up to be. But easy, dear reader, this appearance is deceptive! The result will not be shaken; also, it is not actually being limited, but to the contrary, defined more accurately.

I will now place the "limit" in form of a question here. *At the beginning of the 14th century, had really already all regional churches developed a dogma*? As much as this question may sound wondrous, it is nonetheless necessary. This cannot be doubted now: *if* the medieval faith communities had really organised as "*churches*", then that means, they possessed hierarchy and dogma. Or, we focus more accurately still on the subject of our examination. *Inasmuch* the faith communities had *already* organised as a "church", dogma and priesthood existed with them. *Inasmuch* as this was the case! What? Should christian communities have existed, who did *not* organise in the form of a "church"? Who did not have a dogma and did not tolerate a hierarchy? The possibility of such christian communities cannot be denied, the term "church", however, in its actual sense, could then not be applied to such unions. My answer: in the late Middle Ages, such priestless communities existed. And this time, we can even accept the falsified tradition, under scrutiny of its information of course, as a witness of evidence.

We hear there from the sources on the views of certain Heretics (the Lombardian branch of the Waldensians) the following: "They rejected the hierarchical names such as pope and bishops, … all signs and privileges of their class, but more than anything, the entire social, public-legal and economical outfit of the church and its clergy, … any permanent endowment and funding of rectories and clerical places. The parochial division itself appears to them as a human invention. Their ideal is the by no clerical division squeezed Christianity and its spiritual service by wandering apostles without a permanent residence, depending on the daily alms and donations… and on the fruit of their own manual labour… But the entire system of the clerical ordinations and cultish festivities is also missing[VII]…, so primarily the centre piece of the God service, the mass. The church to them is a stone house, or a straw house, in which God does not live, the prayer will not be heard any better… The altar [is called with them; K.] stoneheap: it is sad that the blankets rot over them… The clerical burial in ordained soil holds no attraction for them." (M., p 110 ff.)

There is much of truth and lies, most intensely mixed together, handed down here; we can however, easily separate the wheat from the lying chaff. Since we are in the epoch before the 15th century, we have to brush aside as purpose chaff all information that is to testify to the existence of the universal church for that time. What is left over after, however, mightily captivates our interest. Because we now hold in our hands the proof, that in the Middle Ages, *priestless* christian communities have indeed existed. Not even special buildings – stone and straw churches – were these "free" Christians tolerating amongst themselves, in which they had "served" God with cultish festivities! Truly, it is quite a peculiar "*free Christianity*" that faces us here. With these Christians, there is no mention of God service, priesthood and dogma, i.e. of an organised community, a "church". Wandering apostles, who, for their livelihood, were depending on alms and the fruit of their manual labour, were their teachers in Christendom; but these apostles were no priests. But halt! These apostles were yes priests, the sources report to us in the same breath! And these apostles were even tightly

[VII] Orig.: 'fällt' = 'is falling', appears to me to be a slip of the quoted author, who may have had in mind: 'fehlt' = 'is missing', although the final result will be just about the same, I guess.

organised, say the sources; namely, they were hierarchically organised in the threefold division deacon, presbytarian, bishop! And this hierarchy of the "free Christians" also represented at least a few dogmatic doctrines, and this small dogmatic treasure, their apostles had stolen from the "catholic universal church"!! Because they also offered to their believers the holy communion. So, according to these source statements, they were, despite their radicalism, not at all so "free" Christians as they sometimes pretended to be. Oh no, the sources chatter, these free ones in Christianity had even reserved for themselves, when they feared for their freedom, the option to run to their mother - the catholic church! – to "receive from the priests of the Roman church the sacraments on whose reception one still placed any value at all." (M., p 115) Quite peculiar "free Christians", truly! The relativistic historians, despite zealously racking their brains, cannot at all make head or tail of this psychological mix of free Christianity; which makes no wonder; because they take what tradition here spryly dishes up, for – cash historical currency.

In the late Middle Ages, dogma- and priest-free christian communities existed; this fact remains as the historical core of the falsified Heretics' sources after stripping its hull. We have thus, in the development of Christianity, found an epoch, in which dogmatic and dogma-less Christianity existed simultaneously and next to each other. The so important question: which of the two forms of Christianity was there first?, in this place, shall only be answered in brief, without me being able to engage in a thorough explanation, since else, I would have to cross the set time border – the year 1300 – backwards. First, there was *life*, then came the *teaching*, too! With dogma and priest, something unheard of new, something dangerous, cold-rational, legal and civil-servant-like, had broken into the religious emotional world of genuine Christianity. Now, what even did christian *living* count for? Much more important was the new, by the priests (theologists) in the holy script "re-discovered" *teaching about Christ*. Your *faith* makes bliss, not your life, thus sounded the new "message of salvation". The free christian communities turned into well organised "churches", which, "from divine mission", addressed to the free Christians the demand to join them. The great struggle for the souls began, which in rough reality, very soon turned into world-political hostile actions.

A most significant question is forcing itself upon us now. How were, seen geographically, dogmatic churches and free christian communities disseminated around the year 1300 roughly? Because of the falsification of the entire Heretics' history, there exists unfortunately no possibility to even only draw anywhere near accurate borderlines; why, the nature of the subject does not even allow for such sharp borderlines at all. We can easily understand this, when we forms a clear mental picture of the formation and development of a dogmatic particular church (of a dogmatic sect) within a *previously organisation-less* christian world. Moving forward from the geographical point of origin of a church for successive square miles without a gap, not *all* free Christians fall to the organised union, assuming that not power of arms would force them into submission. Thus, the districts of the expanding regional churches could potentially for a long time be interspersed by more or less extended enclaves of dogma-free Christians. Eventually, only brute force was capable of eradicating the "Heretics' nests" of these free Christians – in the eyes of the dogma Christians, the

free ones had to be, and be called, Heretics! – in order to design the territory of a church into a geographical uniformity. We may not be able for that reason, not even for a certain point in time, to draw a sharp dividing line between dogma Christians and dogma-less believers, not even between two regional churches, yet, the falsified tradition itself announces to us *a great separating line* in the late medieval Christianity. We see *France* put up on the one side, but on the other, *Upper Italy and Germany*! Namely in the Heretics' history, we perceive this distinction and division, more accurately, in the history of the so-called Waldensians. This great Heretics' family, it is reported to us, was divided into two groups: 1. the Poor of Lyon in France, 2. the Poor of Lombardy in Upper Italy, whom the German Waldensians had closely joined. As the characteristic distinctive attribute of these two groups, the sources name their relations to the Roman universal church: namely, while the French Heretics fought the hierarchy and institutions of the catholic all-church only lukewarmly, the Italian-German Waldensians were confronting this catholic devil's church as deadly enemies. If we now replace "catholic church", which did not exist back then, simply with the word "church", we immediately recognise, what set the French Christians apart from their Italian-German brothers in Christianity. Namely, the principle stance towards the organised dogma church! Nonetheless, we would miss the point, if we were to assume the state of affairs for the year 1300 to be as sharply separated as just hinted. At the beginning of the 14th century, in Italy and Germany as well, well-organised dogmatic particular churches existed; the free Christians had now been pushed back into the defence. They were now considered Heretics, and they were now forced to fight for their faith and their lives.

4. Idea and implementation of the universal dogma

Our description of the general religious situation around the turn of the 13th to the 14th century mentioned only *Christ-believing* human beings. Who, as the relativistic researchers still do today, takes the source tradition of the Middle Ages for genuine history, which had only been a little blemished on the surface by occasional "practical" forgeries, will not have it occur to them that around the year 1300, in Germany as well as in all other European countries, there still existed an open Pagandom. Just what is meant by this word Pagandom, will become immediately clear to the reader, when we denote its meaning by a quite modern term, namely the term "*deism*" [belief in God]. What? *As early as* the 14th century, there were God-believing German people? Put this way, the question is missing the actual point of the problem; it has to ask: *as late as* the 14th century, there still were God-believing people in Germany? Indeed, and their number can in some parts of Germany not have been small at all.

It goes without saying that from the falsified sources on the Heretics' history, it will not be possible to find out the truth on the existence and the number of German "Pagans" of the late Middle Ages. Much more thoroughly than with regards to the Heretics' history, the fathers of the falsification action had to smear and destroy the historical state of affairs with regards to the history of the medieval Pagandom. Thus, the history of the late medieval deism has of course almost completely been re-forged into the christian-heretic; and mostly, these Pagans come under the collective term Mystics and Pantheists. In the sources, there is only very sporadically the vague hint at the possibility (!) of Pagandom. In the history of the vehmique court – which will more thoroughly occupy us in a later book – one script, the so-called Arnsberg Reformation from the year 1437, plays a role. Here, it is decreed that the secret court (vehmique court) is competent to judge "over Christian laymen of male birth, who move from christian belief to disbelief." What is meant by this "disbelief", automatically follows from another "Arnsberg chapter" (from the year 1490), which, amongst others, refers to the secret outlawry: "If someone hatches heresy…, if someone abandons the faith and becomes a *Pagan*."[20] Here we find the Heretics clearly distinguished from the Pagans! It was no longer dangerous for the veiling of the *previous* true state of affairs, if here for such late a time (1490!), it may not have been the actual existence of Pagandom that has not been denied, but merely the possibility of an "abandonment" towards Pagandom. Namely by 1490, stake and sword of the secular arm of the universal church had so thoroughly tidied up amongst Heretics and Pagans, that such church enemies have become rare phenomena by now.

If we want to know how the Pagans of the Middle Ages thought about the Christians, we have to simply contemplate once again, what the "free" Christians thought of organised church Christianity, and further, to intensely imagine the spiritual stance of a human being who, as a matter of principle, has to reject any *written* revelation of God, that is, the holy script as well. In order to get to know the spirit of German Pagandom, we have to only remember that German God-believer who is considered its most significant representative and confessor: *Master Eckhart*. But Eckhart was a scholastic and a mystic Pantheist, what's more, a Dominican, and in the beginning, a loyal son of the catholic church! Yeah well, this is how the tradition presents it; but firstly, this tradition is falsified, and secondly, there can be no talk at all of a catholic universal church in the 14th century. However, Eckhart supposedly died as early as 1327! Furthermore, on the basis of an analysis of his "system", he does not present himself very original, neither as a scholastic, nor as a Mystic. "His thoughts in Mysticism can be proven for as early as the Victorines[VIII]; through the pseudo-areopagistic scripts, neo-platonic principles also entered his Mysticism."[21] According to the above now, this not quite so original Dominican is supposed to be viewed as the most respected confessor of German characteristic deism!? So doubtfully and amazedly can only ask, who considers Eckhart's scripts *untouched*, and who takes the news on his alleged life circumstances, according to prevailing opinion, for the purest truth. The scripts of a man, whom the fathers of the big falsification action schemingly stuck into the cowl of a

[VIII] Congregation of regulated Augustine choir masters, named after the in 1113 founded male voice choir Saint-Victor.

Dominican, have been very thoroughly "overhauled" in the forgers' branches. Only because Eckhart's scripts have been systematically trimmed, do they gain the appearance as if this German Pagan "did not fight the [catholic; K.] church, and did not disregard the sacraments". (H. 5, 1st half, p 279) Only by that, his "wavering character" can be explained, was he able to "well think christian", despite him simultaneously feeling drawn to pantheistic, i.e. unchristian views.[22] And he who is still willing to doubt what may have happened to Eckhart's scripts in the forgery branches, will see everything very clear when they learn: "Clear and unambiguous texts… are confronted by equally clear and unambiguous texts."[22] These tactics are known to my readers. It is of course accurate only according to the description of the falsified tradition, but it does not historically accurately apply, when B Peters explains: "Within him, a new lifestyle makes a breakthrough, a new world view… Eckhart is… a new birth of the German spirit."[23] Eckhart is much rather the by the forgers cruelly christianised proclaimer of the *primevally old*, immortal Germanic world and God view, which he did not have to discover or even re-discover! *Primevally old* Germanic faith ware has been most graciously left alive in Eckhart's scripts by the forgers, after it had been dressed in a christian-Mystic little frock. Also, Master Eckhart did not stand alone, high up on the lonely heights of German spirit. But where is the thought produce, equal in type, equal in value, of his predecessors? It has been destroyed or christianised. Just as the Germanic philosophy of the Middle Ages has been turned into the scholastic philosophy, or gone under in it, respectively.

The number of German God-believers cannot have been small around the year 1300. Namely, e.g. those "heretic" sects are to be counted amongst them, which have been smuggled into the tradition under the name: Brothers of the Free Spirit and "Beghards" by the fathers of the falsification action. What these "apostates" of the "catholic universal church" have been accused of as alleged "main false doctrines", is purposeful invention of the forgers; they could have just as well falsely attributed to these "lost sheep" completely different mistakes. Of course, the main worry of the forgers was to unconditionally suppress before posterity the dangerous fact that in all countries in the late Middle Ages, numerous Pagans, God-believers, existed, that is, not church apostates – because the universal church was only realised in the 15th century – but genuine God-believers, who, like their parents and grandparents and ancestors lived a faith springing from the racial genetic stock. It is remarkable that, according to the sources, the "Pantheistic Beghards" had supposedly "originated" from *Nether Germany*.

For the general religious situation around the year 1300, our investigations have now established this result: *three big groups of religiously interested people existed, namely 1. God-believers, 2. free Christians, 3. church-organised dogma Christians*.

If so far, we have only heard of particular dogmas of the regional churches, we now tackle another one, namely the idea of a christian **universal dogma** and the first attempts at its practical implementation.

We may not be able to say who had first thought up the plan of a universal dogma – in connection with the falsification of the medieval tradition in all other areas, naturally, the dogma history, too, the way it exists, has been falsified – but we know almost accurately the *point in time* of the plan's realisation: the turn of the 13th to the 14th century. And we know still more. We know the country in which the plan became a reality. *France* can claim the honour – if it is one – as the "most christian" country, to be called the birth place of the universal catholic dogma. Why, it can be determined more accurately still, where, and by which men, the universal dogma was created. *The theological masters of Paris University are its creators*! It is useful for now to briefly say the most important things about its [Paris University's] alleged formation, its institutions and its general significance.

According to the sources, Paris University was, in the year 1300, supposedly already able to look back upon a respectable age as a study institution; since the 12th century, it had the "lead" in the areas of philosophy (scholasticism) and theology. This information makes us prick our ears. Because, what does it mean: Paris University was "leading" in theology? It shall thus be expressed that this institution was the clerical authority, who was officially watching over the purity of the "catholic belief". (At a time, when a catholic, i.e. universal belief, did not even exist!) It is the Paris theological doctors to whom the christian world was turning – even the "Roman pope" – when differences of opinion over universal-dogmatic doctrines were to be investigated and reconciled. (At a time, when universal doctrines did not even exist!) So, since the 12th century, Paris University was the highest tribunal – the sources tell us. This theological powerhouse status must appear a little remarkable. What is it with the preference? It has emerged from the "tradition", the historians reckon; of course, "from ancient times, the most learned theologists from all over the world gathered" to Paris. Why, for reasons of tradition! Now, this explanation of habit and tradition is a right nullity. To me, it is not at all intelligible why the most learned theologists would gather "from habit" in Paris, of all places, and not in – Rome! If anywhere, then surely, the christian world capital city Rome would have been the given place for the dogmatic supertribunal! But no, Rome did unfortunately not see the learned society of theologists inside its walls. Also, the most significant medieval law schools were not at home in Rome, but to Ravenna, Bologna and Padua. Furthermore, the medicine students did not go to Rome, but acquired their knowledge and skills in Salerno. Why this shying away from Rome? The readers of my book *Mystery Rome* promptly know the correct answer, and that is: nobody went to Rome, because in the Middle Ages, a town Rome did not even exist. The theological masters would not dream of congregating in the void by the Tiber, but wandered to Paris. Why however, they would turn to Paris, of all places, we will find out a little later.

The philosophical-theological high school of Christianity stood in Paris; with this information, the tradition reports something historically true. Whatever else however, the sources have to tell about this institution, especially about its formation and its early time, must be appreciated very critically, because this pre-history up to 1300, and even beyond, contains a whole lot of purpose fiction. In the 14th century, the

history of the university at least hosts a *core* of genuine facts, and with this epoch, we will now have to occupy ourselves.

In the 14th century, Paris University formed a corporate body, richly endowed with stately and clerical privileges. The inner organisation, the spiritual habitude of this society, found expression in the well-known four faculties (Kollegia doctorum): 1. The seven "Free Arts", or faculty of artists (nowadays, the philosophical), 2. theology, 3. jurisprudence, 4. medicine. In this, the task of pre-educating their students for the studies in one of the "higher" faculties fell to the Artists' faculty.

Yet, we still hear of another form of the university organisation. The members of the learned institution *were arranged by nations*! What members? The professors, or the students, or both classes? Because in Paris, students and teachers from all over the world of Christianity came together. Is it then not very natural and understandable, when the students of a certain country or region closely associated with each other in the foreign city, formed a "nation"? In this "nations" affair however, the sources talk so darkly and reservedly, that the relativistic researchers, with the best of intentions, cannot reach clarity on origin and age of this nation classification, let alone just which university members actually formed such a "nation". Even Denifle, exuberating stupendous learnedness, to whom we owe thorough (relativistic) source research on Paris University, must confess regarding the origin of these "nations": "Since there is not a single document accessible on this, only guesses can be made."[24] In his opinion (ibid, p 81), the actual basic stock of the institution, namely the doctors' faculties, is to be separated from the "nations"; the mutual relations of both organisations, however, remain unclarified. Here, the sources allow for varying (!) interpretations. One time, they create the impression as if *all* faculties – i.e. professors and students – had grouped by nations; the next time, it appears as if only the artists' faculty (doctors and students) had known the principle of classification by nations.

But there is always unison talk of *four* nations at the university. As such are named: 1. the Gauls (Frenchmen, towards whom however, also Spaniards and Italians counted), 2. the English (later also called *German* nation), 3. the Picards [French tribe with own language, from the Picardie region], 4. the Normans. What immediately strikes us is that Picards and Normans, who were also French (and Belgian), have supposedly formed own [separate] nations; it is further striking that the four groups *at first, comprised actually only France* (and then England), and *all remaining nations* had to *simply let themselves be allocated to the four "nation" pigeon-holes*. "This classification by nations is affected", Denifle rightly says, because there is no principle of classification that could be established. I will give away the solution to this difficult nations riddle momentarily, have to still discuss first however, some interesting peculiarities of the university.

All members of the professorate were of the *clerical* class! Even the also to the university belonging scribes and "book dealers" had to have received at least the so-called four minor orders. From that, we can see in whose service this learned institution stood: *in the service of the "church", i.e. of the priesthood and the*

dogma! (Note well however: *not* in the service of the catholic universal church which did not yet exist in the 14th century!) The clerical character of the institution is still nicely illustrated as well by the fact that it is reported, the university did supposedly not possess its own school building; the lectures were held in various monasteries (in Paris). What is further interesting, is the announcement that all candidates of the master grade had to promise by oath "to solve all philosophical questions in the interest of the faith" and to "preserve the secrets (!) of the corporation."[25; IX]

Now that we have familiarised ourselves with the institutions of Paris University, we can return to the original subject of this chapter, the idea of the new, *universal* dogma.

At the beginning of the 14th century, why do we find to Paris, of all places, an institution (university), which acts as a theological-dogmatic tribunal? Certainly, the theologists could not very well gather in the grass-grown void by the Tiber, but why in Paris, of all places? The previously mentioned "nations" classification of the Paris institution leads us on the trail. It was striking that out of the four nations, three fell to France's share. In this quartet, the English nation appears like a foreign body next to the three French ones; we gain the impression that *originally*, the university had been a purely French-national affair. Theologists from various parts of France gathered in Paris. For what purpose? Without question, for the purpose of professing "God-learnedness", i.e. in dogmatic questions and everything connected with it. Now, had a universal church already existed back then – which was not the case – the masters' discussion would have indubitably be aimed at the universal dogma. (Just in passing: that the theological professors of the university simultaneously worked as teachers as well, is for the presented problem a matter of indifference.) Since no universal church with a universal dogma existed yet, the theological work of the in Paris gathered ones can have only been related to *particular* dogmas, i.e. to the difference in type of the dogmas of the regional churches. Now, *French* theologists will not have (or at least not at first and in the main things) concerned themselves with any old doctrines of *foreign* nations and their "churches", but with French-national dogma problems. There is now just one little step to take in order to realise the situation that has lead to the foundation of Paris University. The mysterious organisation of the institution by "nations", however, enables us to this step. We can see from the names that *originally*, regarding these nations, they were merely *French* lands (regions). From these regions of France, theologists gathered in Paris for a meeting on theological-dogmatic issues. The fact that in Paris, the delegates *separated* (by "nations"), is explained by the fact that they were not delegates of a universal church, but of individual (French) *regional churches*. Unification efforts of the French regional churches (uniformation of the dogma and the hierarchy) have lead to the formation of a central "dogma institution" (which has then soon been extended to a teaching institute, the university, in order to pass on the created uniform dogma to future theologists). That such a French-national institute has been founded to Paris, followed from the significance of this city.

[IX] I don't know about you, dear reader, but to me, this has the waft/stench of freemasonry about it.

The process which then *later* unfolded in the form of actual nations' participation, took thus first place on a small scale within the French people (the "nations" as France's regional churches). *The French were the first people who suggested for discussion the plan of a uniform national dogma, and*, as can already be said now, *also the first nation to make this plan a reality*.

The very moment however, in which the first national uniform dogma, and with it, the first well-organised national church, has become a reality in the christian world, in the country of origin, or more accurately, in the original dogma headquarters of Paris University, an enormous dogmatic magnet formed, a religious-dogmatic power centre, which had to radiate its attracting effect in every direction. With that moment, Paris "University" equally automatically moved up to be a dogmatic tribunal in all of Christianity. To the other nations, who all still lived religious-dogmatically without form [formality], divided into regional groups, the French example had to work as an irresistible temptation for imitation – *not* of course to the God-believers and free Christians of the other nations, but to the *hierarchy* of the regional churches outside of France. Unity makes for an increase in strength, and priesthood was naturally intent on an increase of their influence in other countries as well.

An enormous struggle of the spirits over the (temporarily national) standardisation of the dogma began. But only after the course of one whole century, the final objective of these struggles was reached: the universal dogma, and with it, the catholic universal church. Only the first stages of the around the year 1300 igniting clerical-dogmatic struggles can be described in this Book. A struggle of the spirits began, I said. But each single spirit is stuck in a hull of flesh and blood, and so then, in truth quite often, the struggle of the "spirits" is but a struggle of the human beings. Even the loftiest spiritual struggles constantly float around the danger of more or less deeply sinking down to the sphere of the human-all-too-human. The religious spirit should not follow this law of human gravity; but unfortunately, it is a truism of experience that especially the christian-religious spirit did not take, nor does take, a single step without using the "secular arm" for a support. Never has the christian spirit been able to walk from its own strength; it always needed the strong support of the secular arm. The reason is this: in the moment, in which the up to then "free" Christianity, which was a private affair of the soul, dogmatised itself and created a hierarchy, it necessarily changed around into a politicising religion. No dogma without hierarchy, and no hierarchy without totalitarian claim.

From where does this "secular" leaning of *dogmatic* Christianity originate? From the nature of the dogma itself, whose peculiarity, as we have seen above, does not consist of being merely an opinion, but of attaining authoritative validity over all human souls. This claimed authority should very well be a purely spiritual one, but unfortunately, it is incapable of being that. In order for the with a thousand doubts laden dogma to assert itself at all, it necessarily requires the aid by *external* authority. On the one hand now, this authority is primarily the "church", i.e. its clerical civil servantry, its hierarchy; but on the other hand, the priest as such can claim authority only in the sense as he again - derives it from the dogma! The priest references an authority, which only he himself has established! In reality of course, it is not the *dogma* that is

"thirsty for power" and intent on asserting itself, but *the priests*, with the weapon of the dogma, want to assert the "church", *i.e. themselves*. Between dogma and priesthood, a remarkable cycle of cause and effect forms. What is cause, what is effect? We can very beautifully study this circulus vitiosus [vicious circle] with Augustin: "One time [according to him; K.], the script is an instance, which has its authority in the church, the next time, the church doctrine and all consuetudo [customs/habits] is to be measured against the script." (Ha. III, p 115, footnote) What is cause, what is effect? If we want to know this, we must look at the beginning, the origin of dogma and priesthood. In the beginning, there were the theologists! The dogma is a "produce of theology"! Now, the Parisian dogmatists were only humans, too; and although they created the dogma, more accurately, *their* dogma, allegedly as a result of divine illumination, from this dogmatic creation, their creation, sprang *endless advantages* for – *themselves* (!). Again: dogmatists are only human, too. For it resulted from the dogma, that the priest had bestowed upon him an honour which no tongue is capable of describing. Indeed, in the dogma, and via the dogma, priesthood is amply provided for. (In the dogma, the priests *themselves* have amply provided for themselves!) It would be a miracle, had the Parisian dogmatists, in the erection of the dogmatic teaching structure, forgotten to also incorporate the claims of priesthood towards the *secular state*. They have not forgotten, and lo and behold, from the teaching structure "follows", amongst others, that also "the states have no other tasks than to provide for the peace of soul (!) of their subjects by promotion of the virtus [virtues/miracle deeds] in accordance with God's Law [which only the priests can interpret correctly!; K.]." (Ha. III, p 404, footnote 2)

How after the creation of the French national dogma, however, French secular powers provided for the peace of soul of their subjects in practice, or, straight out, how the state, side by side with the hierarchy, asserted the newly created dogma by torture, fire, sword and money, much money, of that, the next chapter shall give an intense impression.

5. The creation of the French national church

Around the year 1300, the theological masters of Paris University, *not perhaps for the first time*, have distilled the alleged quintessence (the dogma) out of the biblical script-Christianity, because at that point in time, there already existed not only in France, but in other countries as well regional churches with dogmas of the most varied provenance. The theologists of course, who gathered in Paris, were delegates of the existing French regional churches, and each group brought with them from "their" church a treasure of certain dogma axioms to Paris. It goes without saying, the delegates, in their conferences, did not want to platonically discuss merely the difference in nature of their individual dogmas; they had to fulfil a very special task. And it was not chance, either, that had placed these men before their task, God himself seemed to have entrusted them with the difficult task. Something lay in the air like a warning and a threat, over the regional churches, over – the priesthood of the individual churches.

What nightmare weighed down the priesthood of the individual regional churches? A frightful question, and an inconvenient one at that; stirred, thoughtful spirits in the hierarchy and also amongst the lay-believers of the different "churches". The *difference in nature* of the dogmas had created that question, and thrown it amongst the believers. That question was this: just which dogma is the *right* one now, is the *true* extract of the divine biblical words? Because surely, only *one* dogma can be the true one! What were the priests in the regional churches supposed to answer when they were confronted with this argument by their thoughtful believers? Truly, a bad nightmare weighed down the priests. Each church could accuse the other: you are wrong, only we have presented the true interpretation of the divine will in our dogmas. A bad nightmare rested on the priests. Was there no possibility to do away with the inconvenient situation? There was a possibility, and the priesthoods of the individual churches in France have not only recognised this possibility, but also first took the steps that such possibility offered to them. The motto of their action was practically forcing itself: union! Unification of the dogma and the regional churches. *Creation of a unified French national church*! Union! That was the task for whose solution the theologists congregated in Paris. Perhaps at first, it was only about the union of the French churches, but on the horizon already, there was emerging the claim for the union of all churches, i.e. the creation of the "catholic" universal church as a future problem.

France first stepped onto the train to the union, and indeed reached the hotly aspired goal: the national church. Prerequisite condition was the creation of a unified (national) dogma; it was fulfilled by Paris University. Then, the most difficult task was to be performed: victorious assertion of the new national dogma. For this however, the struggle of the spirits did not suffice. Blood had to stand in for cement, in order to press together the pieces into unity. The authority of the sword and the stake had to be evoked, in order to victoriously blaze the national dogma its trail. From now on, every Christian (and the God-believing one, too) was a "Heretic" if they refused to "serve" God in the lap of the national church. And many refused. But

already, there had also precautions been taken to bend the stubbornly opposed. The strong "secular arm" was ready to help the dogma (the unified priesthood) to victory. In the conferences of the theological delegates to Paris, not merely dogmatic problems were discussed. Often, very worldly things were deliberated upon behind the closed doors of the "university", and often then in such secret sessions, high-ranking civil servants of the French King Philipp IV. were present. Just what was deliberated and decided upon, would very soon become apparent to all of the world.

The first French national pope. For now, let us listen with the whole child-like trust of the relativists with regards to the authenticity of medieval history, what this "history" has to tell about the clerical ongoings at the beginning of the 14th century in France. In the year 1305, thus goes the history narration, a pope of the universal church (!) was again to be elected. The cardinals of the universal church (!) united their vote on the archbishop of Bordeaux, Bertrand de Got, who, as the pope of the universal church (!), called himself Clemens V. The back then King of France, Philipp IV., is alleged to have "recommended" the candidature of this Bertrand de Got to the electors with some emphasis. Clemens V. and Philipp IV. got on so well, that the new pope made no effort at all to leave France, and, after some wandering around, set up his papal residence in the small Southern French town of Avignon. So it happened, "history" continues narrating, that the "time-honoured" papal chair in the christian "world capital city" Rome remained empty, although according to divine deliberation, the seat of the head of the "universal church" was to be forever and ever in the Tiber town, there, where the graves of the apostle Princes lay. Thus, with Clemens V.'s stay in France, "history" tells, the seventy-year exile of popedom has supposedly begun. However, what the so chatty "history" quite forgets to tell, the most important thing about this exile affair, is a psychological "fact" over which we are simply speechless. Besides exceptions, which were so remote that they do not count, *no* christian soul became upset in any way over the exile of popedom! However, what *this silence* of the sources on an outrage of all of Christianity against the pope, against *all* popes, means, or much rather, how it is to be explained, on that, the reader will have to inform themselves in detail in my Book *Mystery Rome*. Because "history's" simple-minded story of popedom's resettlement from Rome to Avignon is a lie through and through! My readers know it already of course: a catholic universal church with a universal pope to Rome has not even existed before the 15th century. In the year 1305 therefore, neither could the seat of residence of the universal pope be transferred from Rome to Avignon, nor could even a universal pope be elected at all. Then, by whom and as what has Clemens been elected? He has been elected pope of the French national church, that is, by France's shortly before unified hierarchy. Clemens is the first "pope" of the French national church. That Clemens took his residence in France goes without saying, and does not require any discussion.

It was an easy thing for the French hierarchy to vote themselves a head, a "pope". However, it was infinitely difficult to implement the idea of a French national church in reality, to attain for the dogma the factual general validity. That was only possible if the "secular arm" was to lend its energetic hand. And the secular power, in the person of King Philipp IV., was prepared to lend that hand, all the more prepared, since

from the implementation of a national church, the most significant advantages must be headed towards the state and its monarch, too. Depending on the circumstances, worldly politics can be made formidably well with religion, Philipp IV. recognised, and he did not hesitate acting accordingly to such realisation.

Now, we will not want to expect of the falsified tradition, that it tells us in its sources the proper course of the struggles over the implementation of France's national church. That would be an unfair demand. With a truthful account of events, we would have had to primarily admit, on the part of the fathers of the falsification action, that at that time, no universal church with a universal pope existed at all. However, from the general tendency of the big falsification campaign, this admission rendered itself absolutely impossible. So, with the struggles over the national church, all events had to be re-forged, re-interpreted, if one did not think it better anyhow, to spread a cloaking veil over things. So, "history" will report to us only in purposeful disguise on the struggles, which were conducted for the assertion of the new uniform dogma, jointly arm in arm by pope Clemens and King Philipp.

The most well-known disguise of those struggles is offered to us by the falsified tradition in the so-called **Destruction of the Order of the Knight Templars**.

What "history" reports on the alleged formation and the purpose of the Templar Knight Order, furthermore on its institutions and workings up to the catastrophe in the year 1307, can be found in any history book. It is lies that we get to read there. Front to end, the story of the Templars represents a web and maze of lies. The committed fraud convincingly follows from the general fact that before the 15th century, a universal, catholic church – with which the order appeared so connected – did not exist. Again, the fraud axiomatically follows from this general fact. In the following, I nonetheless want to still briefly conduct the evidence of the falsification in one concrete individual case. To make this happen, I will profess in source critique; namely the alleged original *Templar Rule* shall be subjected to a critical observation. This "Rule" contains statute-like rules on the admission of new members into the order, on the Order's Knights' living together etc. In order to see how it stands with this Rule, we follow G Schnürer's information.[26]

The wording of the *original* Templar Rule is handed down to us in one French and one Latin text. The Latin text again is preserved in two hand-writings [V, allegedly from the end of the 12th century, and A, from the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century; K.]. The French version exists in 3 scripts [R.D.P. from the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century; K.]. Which text now is the original one? Schnürer regards the Latin text as the original one, thus considers the French one to be a translation. Another researcher (Prutz) has made a stand for the opposite opinion, of which we will merely take note. With the following message however, we prick our ears: the two texts show *differences* in meaning! "The meaning of the Latin text can [in one place; K.] only be that the Templars, wherever they are sued or prosecuted, have to appear before the court." In opposition to this stands the "translation", in which the meaning has spontaneously changed! "In the French text, there is no mention of an outside court, before which the

Templars are to appear…, but from a court which the Templars themselves are meant to form out of their midst." (Schnürer, p 22) Strange, how the meaning could so totally change via the "translation"! And lo and behold, in another place as well, the meaning of the text morphs under the hands of the "translator"! How is such thing possible?, we ask our researcher. Well, Schnürer responds, this difference stems from a regrettable "misunderstanding of the translator". And unfortunately, Schnürer has to still more often point out "improbabilities and contradictions" in the versions. There is thus, in one place of the French text, something being ordered to the Templar Order Knights, which, as our researcher rightly remarks, "must alienate everybody to the utmost". Namely, the Rule in the French text orders that one is to "preferentially call upon excommunicated (!) knights, in order to motivate them to join [the Order; K.]". What? How? The so good-catholic Order, right after its foundation, decrees in its Order Rule, that one is to mainly motivate *excommunicated* knights to join? "How did the French author arrive at his changes?", Schnürer asks, and we with him. "Did he want to give this decree [in the Latin text; K.] a different meaning?" We are now in utmost suspense, what Schnürer's reply may sound like. "This is hardly likely to me", he reckons, "much more likely is it that he did not understand this bit, and that he tried to work it out as best as was possible."

There we have the tragedy! The man did not understand what he was meant to translate, and works out a meaning "as best as possible"(!). Total changes in meaning flow out of his quill when "translating". This translator must have been a ninny of extraordinary format, or – perhaps, as a Frenchman, he did not know Latin? Why then did he translate, if he had no idea how to? [X] After all, this was not about some homework for school, some training, but about a highly important affair, about the translation of the Order Rule into the French. If, as an amateur, the man did not know much Latin, he only had to approach an expert, a priest, for advice, or much rather, just leave the work to them. Such priests, who were able to translate for them the Latin text, the Templars always had with them, according to the tradition. But no, a bungler must most flightily and ambiguously translate the statutes, and the delighted knights gratefully receive such fabrication of twisted meaning, store it as a precious instrument of their Order Rule in one of their archives, and – have even copies made of this product!

In the meantime already, the readers of my previous books will have smilingly remembered the stately series of mental twin brothers, whom our translation ninny has to show for in the Middle Ages. But how does it stand with the Latin text by itself? Could not this one be authentic? But behold, it, too, has its peculiarities. In the preserved two scripts, the different chapters are sorted differently. That need "barely be noticed particularly", Schnürer reckons on the one hand, but on the other, points out himself another strange phenomenon, namely that "in the same script the chronology [between the preceding table of contents and the

[X] While translating this, I'm getting hot and cold and restless and mixed up – "translation", "translators", you know? Shall Thor's hammer strike me, if I ever operate like the "translators" referred to here, amateur that I may be. *Should* it come to the point that I struggle with the original meaning, you, dear reader, will notice in a footnote, or in these […] without the 'K.' at the end.

chapter text; K.] is not the same; that in V as well as in A, the text does not completely concur with the preceding table of contents in its chronological order." Again, there has some ninny created "confusion", this time, even in the original text!

What already follows axiomatically from the general fact – that before the 15th century, no universal church existed – namely, that the reports about the foundation, the purpose and the alleged deeds of the Templar Knight Order are a pack of lies, has been reinforced by our brief look at the "original Templar Rule". And the *end of the Order*, too, which right now interests us particularly, its destruction, the entire Templar trial, is an enormous web of lies. By more closely entering into the catastrophe of the Templar Knight Order, the evidence for the falsification will not leave to be desired for long.

According to the falsified tradition, what lead to the catastrophe that destroyed the Templar Knight Order? Philipp IV., dubbed the Handsome, France's monarch, has supposedly "decided upon" the destruction of the Order, "history" announces. "*Why* Philipp the Handsome has decided upon the destruction of the Order, has not been fully established as yet", we hear from our relativistic historians. (He. VI, p 412) "Probably…, Philipp was jealous of the power of the order, and greedy for its treasures. Quite ill-suited to his absolutistic tendencies was a corporation, which, so-to-speak, formed a state within a state in France, and had at its disposal a standing force of 15.000 riders, which could potentially become very dangerous for the King." (He., p 412) "What was more, was that only a hearty dip into the possessions of the Order was capable of bringing an end to the embarrassing financial emergency of the King."[XI] (ibid, p 413) Of course, King Philipp was, so say the researchers, not permitted to openly admit, that he strove for the destruction of the Templar Knights merely for greed; he had to, in order to justify his mean actions before the volk, find an "idealistic" cause. So, which "idealistic" back door did occur to the King? "The King could obtain the Templar Estate only on the formal dissolution of the Order. But this could only be achieved, when a prosecution of heresy could be raised and justified… Thus, the Templar Knights had to appear as *Heretics*; then, it was his duty to interfere."[27] However now, the dissolution of the Order was official business of the "catholic universal pope"; so, in order to motivate him to interfere, Philipp had to convince pope Clemens V., that the Templar Knights be wicked Heretics. It was primarily crucial to get possession of "evidence" for the heresy of the Order members; and there it is, as Hefele thinks, "an indisputable fact that Nogaret [the King's keeper of the seal; K.], in unison with some conscience-less priests (!), the father confessor of the King also amongst them, had, some time before the carrying out of the planned strike, professed in some unclean practices, partly with *apostate* Templar Knights, or those *banned* from the Order, partly with those who, under shameless mockery of the law, were taken to prison and maltreated there." (He., p 415, footnote 2) So, by torture and other unclean practices did King Philipp obtain the desired "evidence", and went on to describe to the "universal pope" Clemens "the Order as a pool of vice, horrors and heresies. However, neither was the King willing, nor permitted, to wait for the clerical investigation of which the pope had held out a prospect as a result of those

[XI] Coincidence and timing as you would else find them only in mainstream fiction, no? I sense that 'style' again.

disgraceful defamations; he would have thus inevitably been revealed as an honourless slanderer; he had to much rather pre-empt it [the investigation] by an act of violence." (He., p 415) This Royal stroke of violence was, that on 13th October 1307, early in the day, all Templar Knights in all of France were "arrested" and lead into prison. The then beginning great trial, which was carried out simultaneously by the Royal and the papal side, ended with the desired objective: the burning of numerous Templar Knights and the dissolution of the entire Order. – In about this way, our researchers say, has the deplorable catastrophe of the Templar Knights Order unfolded, according to the source reports. The Order has been sentenced innocently, i.e., in reality, it was not guilty of the accused horrors and of heresy – that, today, is quite the prevailing opinion of the historians.

I now move on to a critical examination of the Templar catastrophe. This examination will confirm, what we already know: as much as the entire "history" of the Templars, so too, the catastrophic end is a web of lies. Not a web of lies in the sense, that a complete invention of facts were presented; no, the alleged Order catastrophe is based upon a complex of real historical events: around the year 1307, countless humans indeed have been destroyed as "Heretics" in France! Under certain limitations, one could even talk of an "Order" (or better: two), which has been destroyed back then. I will get back to this towards the end of the chapter.

Right away already, with the above brief information on the cause of the catastrophe, the odd reader will have been grabbed by amazement over the psychology of the acting main characters in this drama. On the stage, on the planks that only mean the world[XII], one could indeed set this Templar drama in motion, the way it was poeticised, without taking much offence over its psychology. But in life, i.e. seen as a partition of previous living experience, the psychology of the actors does not please us at all. Just let us have a closer look at that thing under the critical microscope.

On the 13th October 1307, the world, not just a little amazed over it, was surprised by the news of the ensued arrest of all Templar Knights in France. Now, we have all cause to be amazed, too. So, in the numerous places of France, a police lieutenant lay his hands on a Knight's shoulder, and declared them arrested. Completely paralysed by surprise, the Knights gave in to their fate, and followed the Royal civil servants into prison. What? Then nothing, nothing at all, had leaked out of the King's wicked plan? Have Philipp's consultations with his clean ministers and with pope Clemens taken place in all secrecy, so that the Knights learned nothing at all of the looming disaster? According to a received Royal manifest from 14th September 1307, Philipp has, as early as a month before his action, notified his civil servants in the country of the arrest decree at the same time as of the damn-worthy offence of the Templars. No cry of warning has reached the poor victims, because really, all civil servants in the country have kept strict silence on the coming events. Surely, they could not likely have given anything away, because how else could it be explained that the Templar Knights simply let themselves be "arrested", without putting up the most bitter resistance?

[XII] German expression: 'die Bretter, die die Welt bedeuten', lit. 'the planks that mean the world' (but without the 'only') = the stage; so, the stage 'only' *means* the world, but it *is* not.

Above, we heard of 15.000 Templar Knights – well understood, Knights! A stately number, and a strong force when they were armed! And the Knights also had a ready-for-battle army of so-called *serving* brothers-in-arms at their disposal! Just imagine, something had leaked out of the King's wicked plan, and the Order Knights had taken countermeasures! It would have looked bad to the utmost for the "arrest" of the Knights! But to King Philipp's luck, all civil servants kept shut, and the Templars could be nabbed.

But the Templar catastrophe must not have been dramatic fiction, had it not surprises in store for us. The so-far keeper of the seal, archbishop Ascelin of Narbonne, so the tradition reports, refused to "sign the bandit-like assault as a state act", and was "replaced by the conscienceless Nogaret." (He., p 415) But of course, the archbishop, too, could have kept silent, despite not agreeing with the state act, certainly. However, what are we to think of the Order Knights, when we hear the following? Months before already, "pope" Clemens has notified the Order Master Jacob of Molay of the accusations raised against the Templars, and Molay himself demanded back then "an exact investigation because of the crimes with which his Order was charged." (He., p 413) So, the Order Master, and through him, quite certainly the Knights as well, was at least informed of the spread accusations! However, of the planned "state act", Molay and the Knights need not have learned anything yet. But now, we really begin wondering, because: "Despite all care, a little information of the assault had leaked out; proof for this is the journey of the Great Preceptor Peraud to the pope at the beginning of October, as well as several members leaving the Order especially during this critical time." (He., p 416) So, a little information had indeed leaked out; and this "fact" alone is sufficient to ban the alleged "arrests" of the Order Knights , i.e. their alleged complete surprise and paralysis of willpower, into the fairy tale realm. If only the very least of the Royal plan had leaked out, then immediately, the smallest bit of information would have spread amongst the Order Knighthood like an avalanche. In that case however, the threatened Templars would not have hesitated thoroughly preparing for a counterstrike, and probably only a few Order members, who possessed exuberating trust in the righteousness of the Royal monarch, would have let themselves be outright arrested then. The unintelligible behaviour of the Order Knights before their "arrest" is the first psychological mystery that the Templar drama presents to us.

Another psychological problem concerns King Philipp as the originator of the catastrophe. What was it again, that was supposedly motivating the monarch to destroy the Order? The greed for the great estate and the vast riches of the Order; the state coffers, thoroughly emptied by war-waging, had to, and were supposed to be filled again by direct access to the fortune of the Templars. Especially of the Templar Order, the King, as the sources purport to know, had already borrowed off the stately sum of 500.000 Pounds. Now, if the decisive strike was to succeed, Philipp would not only have rid himself of the debt, but what's more, he could establish a new, rich source of income by confiscation of the Order estates. Such general considerations may sound quite intelligible, and may seem suited to explain Philipp's "state act", but a small examination sample is enough to find out the insecurity of the factual and psychological basis. Because "history" reports that in that critical year, Philipp IV. lived on extraordinarily *good* terms with the Order. We have already heard, that

he did not knock on the cashier's door of the Order in vain, when he needed money. On the other hand, we hear nothing of the Order's board now suddenly playing the poor or stingy man towards the financial claims of the monarch, that they had *not* been prepared to put further funds at the state treasury's disposal. If we want to believe the tradition, it has even become a "life purpose" of the rich Order to do business with money; after all, "in the Middle Ages, the Templars [had] the actual money trade in their hands". (He., p 413, footnote 1) So, if Philipp needed money for the state treasury, then it was a convenient and quite un-dangerous way, what's more, with the state of affairs, certainly not hopeless, if he took further loans with the bankers' Order.

What did the King do however? If the tradition were true, the King did not do what lay closest, but what lay furthest; not the most reasonable, but the most unreasonable, not the most secure, but the most dangerous. He plunged into an affair that could cost him the neck. Then who guaranteed that the bandit action would unfold as was meant to be put in scene? If some information on the planned roguery leaked out? This, the King, who was a clever and cautious man, *had* to expect; and that meant that one day, he could stand in front of his entire people as a proven crook. Because everywhere, and quite particularly in the "higher" circles, the Order was very respected. (Lo., p 239) The Grandmaster was even godfather to one of the Royal children! Consider also the following difficulty: assuming, the Knights let themselves be arrested without resisting, would it be successful to effectively convict the Knights of the ridiculous heresy *falsely attributed* to them? There may have been obedient Royal tools amongst the inquisitors – but this time, it was not about the discovery of a really existing heresy, but about the forceful extraction of a falsely attributed heresy, what's more, with personalities, who had previously enjoyed the highest respect. (Always assuming that the tradition of the so-called Templar trial is authentic; which, in reality, is not the case of course!) Even when the state coup had found such smooth dispatch [nothing, or at least as good as nothing had leaked out!! The Knights could be arrested without noteworthy resistance!!; K.], "the previous high esteem of the generally respected Templar Knight Order, despite the fickleness of the people's favouritism, could not be turned into its opposite, and the enormous upset of the people not be calmed, even by the weighty Royal prosecution." (He., p 417) A reasonable and cautious man *had* to take into account all these dangerous eventualities; and King Philipp, too, would have done so, i.e. he would have taken the so quite un-dangerous path of the loan with the Order – if, yes, if the whole Templar trial were simply no psychologically bungled drama fiction!

Even the relativistic researchers often shake the learned head in despair over the actors of this drama. Should it really have been the King's greed for money that infused into him the plan of the Order's destruction, some researchers ask themselves. No, they declare, at least the hope for monetary gain was not the only and not even the most prevalent motivation. "Iron state-political necessity" has determined Philipp to tidy up with the Templar Knight Order, some historians explain to us. The Order had been a foreign, disturbing element within the French nation, who, *on the basis of privileges*, withdrew from its duties towards the state system, and who predominantly stood hinderingly in the way of the by the king followed main tendency of his politics – namely the state union. Alright then. But now someone please tell me, why Philipp then for the attainment

of the state-political objective not went the *legal* way! Because without plunging into a dangerous and stupid adventure, and quite unnecessarily staking his reputation as a man of honour, the King could reach his objective – the legal way. Simply by a legal cut of the Order's troublesome privileges! Indeed, Philipp had already supposedly employed these legal tactics once before: because around the turn of the year 1286/1287, so the tradition reports, he had ordered "all estates, which the Order had bought during the previous 30 years, confiscated and managed by his civil servants".[28] What should hinder Philipp, I ask, to by and by extend the confiscation also to the estates bought before 50 or 100 years in France? His "echo" perhaps, the "universal pope" Clemens?! But no, this Royal drama hero must not do what lay closest and is safest, but he must do what lay furthest and was the stupidest! Because the writers of this tragedy wanted it so; and the writers – the forgers – were simply forced by their general tendency to trim and clip the historical facts of the "Templar catastrophe" so, that the result really was a psychological tragicomedy. It is unnecessary to bring up further psychological improbabilities and impossibilities. We already know now: the Templar catastrophe in the handed down attire is a web of lies. And of course, the alleged interrogation protocols are also products of the late medieval history falsification action.

The whole "Templar" tragedy does not however, I have already stressed this once before, represent a, from start to end, throughout invented history falsification; much rather, the whole thing is based upon a historically genuine core. What is this historical core?

We get immediately onto the trail of the historical events, which the falsified tradition has purposefully masked as the alleged tragedy of the Templar Knight Order, when we remind ourselves of the results of the previous chapter. It is true alright, that the French King Philipp IV. and his clerical counterpart, the first French national pope Clemens, at the beginning of the 14th century, have waged a bloody annihilation campaign against quite certain circles of the people of France. Once the creation of the *French national church* was a decided matter, it was crucial to fulfil a very difficult task: the general assertion of the new uniform dogma, or, in other words: the subjugation of all who resisted. We know these who resisted, the so-called Heretics. *The annihilation fight went against the free Christians and the Pagan God believers*. Viewed from a national-clerical standpoint, these religious rebels were indeed guilty of a crime – heresy; and the King, too, was able and forced to interfere with violent state measures against such church enemies, as soon as his state council – and that consisted almost completely of vested interest, namely members of the unified hierarchy – declared heresy and enmity against the church a state offence. It is very probable, certain actually, that in this heretic annihilation fight, it came to a real, big fighting action, but also to numerous arrests with successive trials. It is equally certain that amongst the "Heretics", there were many *Knights*, who were persecuted, incarcerated and burned as church enemies. The by the forgers effected poetic dress-up of events (as catastrophe of the alleged Templar Knight Order) thus leaves fairly many truly historical details shimmering through. However, the subjugation struggle of the secular arm of the only just created French

national church did not only go against Knights and high persons, but against each Frenchman, who from now on refused to serve God in the forms of the organised church religion.

6. The root cause of the German discord in the late Middle Ages

The entire 14th century presents to us, in the mirror of history, Germany – and also Italy, by the way – as the classical country of discord, what's more, the most dangerous kind of disunion: the *domestic* discord. If we shift our focus away from France towards the late medieval Germany, then the glaring difference regarding the volkish unity becomes painfully visible. The peculiarity of this domestic discord makes itself known by the long-lasting duration and in the gaping depth between the opposites. Embittered and alienated, we wonder: what kind of power is this, that can so deeply split a people? Which dangerous power has fanned this discord back then, and has managed to constantly keep it burning? To put it more concretely: what, as a mysteriously working factor, is hiding behind the alienating fact that almost every German King of the 14th century, beginning with Adolf of Nassau, was looking at his Royal rival beside him? The double-Kingdom had become a matter of political habit: which fission fungus had created such permanent opposites?

Naturally, the historians have sufficiently tortured their brains over the insane German discord of that century. Which explanation do they offer us? It is the following: the in all areas emerging disruption of the German people supposedly finds its reason in the fact that back then, *no tight state bond* [had] *kept together* the people of the Germans. Very well, Messieurs historians; but does one not notice the hidden circular reasoning on which this thought is based? Naturally, a tight state bond, i.e. a powerful Kingdom, would have blown out the fire of discord. But just that is the big question of course: why was such a strong, united Kingdom lacking back then? Who prevented the uniform Kingdom, and with it, the tying of a strong state bond around the German people? Indeed, it is a case of fatal circular reasoning, if one demonstrates: the discord broke out *because* a strong Kingdom was missing; because now, we immediately ask: what has *prevented* a strong Kingdom? Answer: the mysterious German discord! Thus, the searcher goes around in circles, until they realise that it is crucial to investigate the mysterious root cause of two inter-connected phenomena (the discord *and* the lack of a strong Kingdom).

Has the devil sown the discord amongst the German people in the 14th century? One who tends to believe in magical influences (i.e. one who does not enjoy straining their thinking power), could indeed argue in that way.[XIII] However, the state of affairs is explained quite naturally, quite humanly.

Namely how? It is always the in the ideas accumulated spiritual tensions of force, which move mankind inside their innermost, and determine their thinking and will. Barely a human is capable of fully resisting the spiritual vortex of a great idea; they will be forced to take a stand, be it in an affirmative or in a negative sense. But what was the idealistic situation in the German people at the beginning of the 14th century? The reader knows how to answer this question without hesitation, because our investigations in the previous chapters have put us in a position to equally look straight at the centre of the idealistic wheelwork of that epoch. As a spiritual power centre, we perceive *the religious phenomenon*. We remember the great revolutionary changes, which had unfolded in the religious sphere, and which were continuing to further unfold with the beginning of the 14th century. The idea of the *dogmatisation* of Christianity represented the pinnacle of the religious revolution, and radiated its tensions across the beginning of the 14th century. In the followership of the dogmatisation, a particular class, as originators and representatives of the idea, has emerged from the previously uniform mass of the Christ-believers: the *priesthood*. By speaking out this word, we have now simultaneously found and marked the sought root cause of the German discord! *Priesthood has sunk the seed of oppositeness into the German people*!

How could this have been possible? Because in the nature of priesthood, there lies rooted the obsession with religious totality, with despotic rule in the Empire of the souls, and, in connection with this, the absolute necessity of intolerance. A priest is a servant of the dogma, but a tyrant to the soul. Why, his "divine duty" consists of anywhere and everywhere asserting respect for the *dogma*, of making *his* dogma rule over *all* souls. The priest does not want to sow discord; what he wants is to victoriously assert the dogma. Necessary by nature however, this violent assertion creates as a resulting phenomenon the discord, whether the priest may be intent on such collateral phenomena or not. When therefore in the Middle Ages, one set out to dogmatically organise Christendom (to found regional *churches*), the spirits parted ways. They parted ways all the more, the more particular churches advertised for their dogmas and the souls. However, the biggest barrier now raised itself between dogma Christendom on the one side, and the dogma-free Christendom and God-believing Pagandom on the other. The dogma with its fundamental intolerance worked amongst the German people of the 14th century like a dangerous fire hearth, which created ever new flames of discord. Characteristic God-belief is tolerant by its nature, because it does not know of any "formulated and organised" belief, and does not compel to it, either. And even a truly dogma-free Christendom (i.e. a Christendom

[XIII] A pity that Kammeier did not seem to have any concept of freemasonry whatsoever; else, he would not have delivered this paragraph up to here, naming him for no good reason, using the wrong argument in suggesting the partially wrong answer. It really is the greatest trick that this ugly, lying coward has ever pulled off – to make (most of) us believe that he does not exist. Volumes have been written about it, so I'll just leave it there for now.

without dogma,without priesthood, without church) could be tolerant, since it does not lay in its nature to assert dogmatic doctrines. But when one wanted to bend the God-believers and free Christians under a dogma belief, wanted to force on them an organised religion and the church with its clerical civil servantry, an insistence on their tolerance would have been treason on their souls; at that point, they had to make a stand, and potentially switch from defence to attack.

With the dawn of the 14th century, however, the power relations in the religious (and corresponding with it, in the political) sphere had developed to the disadvantage of the God-believers and free Christians. Just as in France, so in Germany, too, the clerically organised dogma Christendom was victoriously making headway. And just like beyond the Rhein, so in Germany, too, the regional churches were pushing for *union*, for a unified *German national church*. However, this goal was not reached in Germany, a German national church could not be implemented; in Germany, the regional-clerical priesthoods have never been able to merge into the perfectly uniform hierarchy as in the French national church. Who has prevented this union? Who is to blame that in Germany, the regional-clerical development was unable to progress to the national church? The answer is: *the French national church is to blame*!

At first glance, this answer seems to be alienating. What could the only just constituted French national church have to do with Germany's clerical state of affairs? But let us rather formulate our question like so: what could the French national church have *in common* with the German regional churches in terms of interests? The absolutely most important, the basic interest, was commonware – namely, the *dogmatic problem*!

Via its peculiarity as the first realisation of a *uniform dogma*, the French national dogma carried dangerous forces of attraction and attack with it. By its plain realisation, by its plain existence, the French uniform dogma had to be an example as well as a warning for the remaining dogma Christendom. An old, burning question had to sound louder than ever by the existence of the French general dogma: just which of the many (regional-clerical) dogmas is now actually the true expression of the divine will of revelation? In France, an entire people (perhaps not yet in reality, but in theory) avowed to *one* dogma. What?, the believers on this side of the Rhein were wondering: should not particularly in this *uniform* dogma God's true will have expressed itself? If so many people think uniformly, must not God have had his hands in it? Then, do *our* doctrines still rightfully exist? No!, it naturally sounded from the mouth of the first French national pope Clemens: you are wrong, are Heretics! Only *our* dogma can raise the claim to be the only true formulation of the christian belief! The French national dogma is in truth the all-dogma, the divine universal dogma!

Such fanfares sounded across from France (of the curia to Avignon and the university to Paris) into Christianity. And as always, France's unified hierarchy naturally felt duty-bound by divine order to attain authority for *their* dogma, *the* dogma per se, in all of Christianity. Not only in France itself, but also beyond

the national borders, the French uniform dogma had to conquer dominion of the souls with the support of clerical (and political!) weapons "following God's order".

At this point at last, we have been put in a position to recognise meaning and origin of all those power struggles in Germany, which thoroughly confuse the 14th century; finally, we are in a position to realise where the root cause of the German discord of those decades lay mysteriously hidden.

From the moment on, in which within the German people, as a result of the ensued dogmatisation of Christianity, religious groups formed, who in the regional churches confronted free Christians (and the God-believers), there was, in cases of King elections, no more thinking of the nomination and assertion of *one* candidate. Each of the belligerent camps had to, from now on, be necessarily intent on lifting *their* King on the shield. If "history" of that century traces the over and over occurring phenomenon of the *double Kingdom* back to all possible political constellations within the electorate, then, in principle, it [history] is not quite wrong (because we know that the dogma requires the secular arm for its assertion), it only wisely and deliberately silences, upon what, as an innermost driving force, such politics were based.

It can now by no means be my task here, to follow the breaking out power struggles over the dogma into each individual phase; only the high and turning points of the dogmatic-political ongoings shall be placed in the critical focus. We therefore skip the events around the Kings Adolf of Nassau and Albrecht of Austria, and turn towards the history of **Henry** VII.

Here now, the reader will immediately and rightly come out with the question of amazement: where is the Royal rival of Henry VII. then? He does not exist. And there is a good reason for this! However, the reader asks: what?; so, the described religious opposites were not present with the election of Henry of Luxemburg? They were present, but they were not effective. How is this explained?

In order to understand how things were standing with the – in a wonderful way unanimous – election of Henry, it requires the following reminder. Back then, the church Christians, too, did not form a stable dogmatic-clerical unity, they lived in separate regional associations. In practice, it meant that between these regional churches, there existed a fundamental rivalry, which had to potentially work more or less strongly against each other. (They may all have been dogmatic Christians, but they were swearing by different dogmas.) Especially with the election of a new King, the danger lay near, that the rivalry of the regional churches would erupt so strongly, that a *uniform* policy of the dogma Christians became impossible. Certainly, as a whole (albeit a very dissolute whole), the church Christians opposed the free religion communities in sworn enmity. As soon, however, as a significant, immediate advantage was to be snapped up for the priesthood of *one* particular church, this clerical special group could well be inclined to temporarily come to an agreement with certain groups of "free" Christians or God-believers. Potentially, the free Christians were – if the attacks against them were temporarily halted – easier to get along with than the zealous dogmatic rivals. What made the situation still more complicated, was the finding regarding the

geographical dissemination of the dogmatic churches and the free communities, which we have pointed out above, and which was characterised by religious enclaves and exclaves. While in the South and the Southwest of Germany, the church Christians (themselves, however, split into particular churches again) held the field, in the East, the "free" Christians, and in the North, the "Pagan" God-believers had significant influence to throw into the scales. After all, everything depended on whether the clerical and free communities found strong support in the secular powers and reigning Princes (whereas, for the part of the clerical groups, the ideal solution had to be the *unification* of a high clerical with a princely office in *one person*!).

Letting our look rest on the described chaos of the rivalling religious interests (and thus, political ones, too) in the German people at the beginning of the 14th century, it is easy to see that an a*greement* over a candidate for King was a difficult, why, almost impossible thing. And yet, Henry VII. was elected "unanimously"! Once again: how is this explained? Quite simply by the psychological fact that often, in a struggle of interests, *a neutral, over the parties standing* candidate appears to be the happiest solution. This "neutral" solution has now been attempted with the election of Henry VII. That, however, Henry of Luxemburg, of all people, has been pushed into the election arena as a neutral candidate, this precedent is France's work, to put it more accurately, is the work of the first French national pope Clemens. The neutrality, however, Henry brought by his attribute of not (quite) being German, but to at least three quarters – a Frenchman!

The only just constituted French national church intervenes in European politics – that is the signature of the beginning 14th century, that is now, for a whole century long, the mysterious, last root cause of all dogmatic-clerical and political events in Europe, and not to the least in Germany and Italy. Naturally, even the French national church did "actually" not want to have anything to do with politics; naturally, it was also "actually" the only concern of Clemens and his French national hierarchy, to prepare the souls (naturally, in the French fatherland) for salvation; as all church folks protest and assure, so Clemens, too, "actually" only wanted to perform the divine (dogmatic) order on the souls by everywhere procuring the due authority for the divine will (the dogma, *his* dogma). Certainly: it was "actually" the mission of France's national church, to assert the *dogma* (their dogma) in all of the world, and this naturally, "actually" only with spiritual and mental weapons. But what, if it turns out that the with a thousand doubts laden dogma, with the two authority crutches of the spirit (theology and philosophy), can only toilsomely totter a small piece of the way? Then, the divine summons goes out to the "secular arm", to blaze the dogma its trail! And we have learned it: in France, the secular powers fulfilled God's (the church's) order to help "his" dogma on to victory, most willingly.

The French national church intervened in Europe's secular politics: from this fact, the following strange plan is to be explained. The French King Philipp the Handsome addresses to the German electors the wish to put the dispatched *German* King's crown on the head of his brother, the *Frenchman* Charles of Valois! A very wondrous wish, indeed. This French plan has so far always been assessed under the "secular" aspect by the historians, under the assumption, that it was based upon Philipp IV.'s profane-political expansion

longings. Of course now, the French plan *also* shows a prominent profane-political side. The question is only: is this genuine secular politics? Or was the secular-political only the outer appearance of an inner reality entirely different in nature? Was Philipp's politics only a pretext, an intro? Was it perhaps so, that the King may have acted, but somebody else has been thinking for him, and guiding his steps? This other one could then only have been "pope" Clemens.

In passing, it is unavoidable to throw a glance at the mutual relations of the French King and the French pope. Which of the two was the strong man, who decided there, what was going to happen? The historians are in agreement that King Philipp was the superior statesman, who cleverly knew how to harness "his" devout, not very strong-willed pope to his political advantage. Philipp thought, and Clemens had to (albeit reluctantly) act according to the Royal directives – this is how the historians see the state of affairs up to this day, and reference the sources for it. However now, the state of affairs is purposefully veiled by the falsified sources, or rather, it is stood on its head. In truth, Philipp was the servant of his master, the pope Clemens (or, to put it more accurately: Philipp was the tool of the unified French national hierarchy, whose representative was merely played by the "pope"). What has mislead the history researchers to consider King Philipp the strong, decisive man, is, amongst others, his "leading" role in the Templar trial. But we know that this Templar trial, the way the sources describe it, is a maze of truth and fiction, and that with the historical process, which as the genuine core is the basis of the Templar trial – the destruction of the Heretics resisting the national church – the hierarchy played originator and leader. In the alleged Templar trial, the French King has only become active as the secular arm of the church. Not the King has pushed the "universal pope" to action against a depraved order, but the national pope (the hierarchy) has prompted the King to act against the Heretics, and has also successively known how to use him as beadle of his interests. In order to gain clarity on the Philipp-Clemens relations, we may well also want to take a brief note of the following, in the sources deployed tactics: every time, *only then* does the allegedly so weak-willed pope let the King push, prompt or "force" him, if it is (before posterity) good and most suitable, that he *appears* to be the "forced"! Every time, only then does the tradition present pope Clemens as the pitiable man, who has been "forced" by the King to such evil deed, when it is advantageous for the good reputation to lay the blame for a precarious deed on somebody else. (So for example, in the so-called Templar trial, and later, when the poor Clemens has to "drop" Emperor Henry VII. "against his will", since on order of the King, his three sons and other high-ranking personalities undertook a direct attempt at blackmail with the pope!) In such precarious cases – however, in the tradition *only* in such cases – Clemens always lets himself be "forced" by Philipp. But remarkable, never does Philipp succeed in forcing the pope to anything that the latter *did not want himself, anyway*, what would perhaps go *against* the interest of the church!

The trimmed-to-fit tradition else proves as well, how little King Philipp had the "popedom under his control", how much, quite to the contrary, pope Clemens (the French hierarchy) did, what he himself and his hierarchy wanted. Because we hear that Clemens was not dreaming of being at the King's service in the matter

of his brother Charles of Valois, that much rather, he worked against the King by having Henry of Luxemburg elected German King. France's mistress was the unified national hierarchy, and its exponent "its" pope. However, King Philipp was the obedient secular servant of the French national church, the servant especially of pope Clemens.

While the original French plan, to lift the King's brother upon the German throne, fell through, pope Clemens was yet favoured by fortune with *his* candidate, Count Henry of Luxemburg. Fortune, however, has been quite strongly enticed by Clemens himself. Now, who was this Henry, Count of Luxemburg?

The German King-to-be Henry VII. "was a Frenchman by language and nature of thinking, albeit his Luxemburgian county formed part of the German Empire… It was Philipp the Handsome who knighted him, and whose vassal he became". (Lo., p 248) An odd candidate for the German crown, this Count, who committed himself to the French King for vassal service in exchange for an annual rent! Who could barely speak one word of German! If already now, the reader is beginning to guess that it is unlikely that the German electors, out of themselves, had gotten the idea for this peculiar throne candidate, they are guessing correctly. This three-quarter Frenchman with the onehundred percent French way of thinking has been presented to the German people by the French national church, by pope Clemens. Even the falsified tradition admits that this Count of Luxemburg received wishes for luck and blessings to take with him on his Royal journey by Clemens, not perhaps by King Philipp. Later, as the "contemporary" chronicler Mussatus reports, Henry himself has told, who were his "leaders" and "instigators": God and pope Clemens![29] Here, the chronicler may have Henry talk of his army campaign to Italy, but we know that his admittance applies to his entire Royal career. Henry had a younger brother, Balduin, who was archbishop of Trier, and thus elector. In practice, *his* efforts succeeded to assert the brother's accession to the throne with his electoral associates. Balduin has also been raised in France (!), and "history" announces that he owed his appointment to archbishop of Trier to French influence.

Here, we have to halt again for a moment; because we are stumbling across the word 'archbishop'. Why? We know that before the 15th century, a catholic universal church did not yet exist. From this axiom now follows that at the beginning of the 14th century, bishops and archbishops could not have possibly been nominated and appointed by a non-existing universal pope; that back then, there could not have existed any priests of a universal church at all. In this respect, the course of our investigation leaves no doubt about this: inasmuch as bishops and archbishops existed in the individual regional churches, they had attained such hierarchical upper positions by the will of *their* believers (i.e. in practice: by agreement of the relevant regional priesthood). So, the individual archbishops formed the pinnacle of the regional churches' priestly hierarchy in the sense that they were independent chiefs, equally "regional popes", committed only to their community of believers. As long as the individual German regional churches were separate communities, there was no further instance above the individual regional pope. In this sense, Balduin was archbishop of

Trier, and, as we directly want to list along with it, Peter of Aspelt to Mainz, and Henry of Virneburg to Köln [Cologne]. *Three archbishops: three regional churches in Western Germany*!

Now these three named archbishops were also, as is well-known, members of the collegium which had to elect the German King. Then, when Balduin of Trier stepped forward with the candidature of his brother Henry, this suggestion found a remarkably swift and noisy ovation from both his clerical colleagues. Should we trace this concurrence with the already mentioned Mussatus back to the direct "rule of the deity", or can Earthly-human reasons be found for it? Really quite humanly explainable causes can be found. In which direction these lay, becomes immediately clear to us, when we hear that all three archbishops and clerical electors "were in league with France". By "France", pope Clemens, i.e. the French national hierarchy, is referred to. By the way, tradition itself reports that Balduin of Trier and his brother Henry of Luxemburg, not long before the latter's election to German King, had stayed with Clemens at the papal court to Poitiers. But what business did the "archbishops" of Trier, Mainz and Köln have with the French church and its chief? The example of the mosquitoes who strive for the light can illustrate the situation, in which the hierarchy of the three Western German regional churches was facing the French national church. As has already been mentioned above, the French uniform dogma was, by its sheer existence, effective as an enormously strong magnet in the christian-religious sphere. This dogma, as a national uniform dogma, stepped up to the field with a significantly higher weight regarding its divine truth content than the individual particular dogmas. Not least are we permitted to credit this majority weight to the Parisian theologists, who did not fail to thoroughly underpin their dogma from its birth not only theologically, but also philosophically. Add to this the peculiar phenomenon that the truth content of a dogma seems to grow equally automatically with the mass of its believers. If now a whole volk stands for a dogma, then from it, a magical conviction of truth radiates, and darkens each "small" particular dogma with its blinding light. What so many people unanimously believe, that must surely be divine revelation truth! Naturally, such opinion was strongly spread amongst Christianity by the French priesthood; and just these mentioned "relations" of the Rhein archbishops to pope Clemens tell us that indeed, *dogmatic approaches* were not only in the air, but had already lead to certain results. The Parisian dogma was on the march beyond France's borders, and has obtained firm ground in Germany as well as in Italy. The influence of the French dogma is then also to blame, that in these two countries, the implementation of a (German and Italian) national church has not been realised.

However, not only idealistic (dogmatic) reasons have prompted the priesthood of some regional churches in Germany and Italy to seek backing by France's national church. Let us recall to our memories, that the regional churches, seen geographically, were no firmly closed uniform entities. We must also not imagine the particular churches of the three Western German "archbishoprics" as closed, uniform masses of space – this homogeneous form, the archbishoprics have received only around a hundred years later as parts of the then implemented catholic universal church – but as split up formations of land. So far in Germany, the secular arm had not yet lead the resisting ones to the church with brutal violence; in the area of that regional

church, there still lived more or less influential circles of free Christians and God-believing people. In the sphere of a particular church, such Heretics and Pagans were here and there able to keep the upper hand, and especially in some towns, that was the case. They could also regain lost territory at any time. However, as long as things were still in a constant flow, the situation of the hierarchy of a regional church could often not have been the most up-looking. In its very own interest (in the interest of the dogma, we could say at any time), the priesthood of the individual churches had to be careful of consolidation and clarification of the religious conditions. It was inevitable that for example the "archbishops" of the neighbouring particular churches got in touch with each other; and already before the constitution of the French national church as well, relations to French regional churches had necessarily been established and maintained. Then, when France's *national church* had become a reality, the archbishops and clerical electors did not only come ever stronger under the ban of the French uniform dogma, but were perhaps still stronger blinded by the *secular* position of power of this big church, from whom they could hope for strong support for *their* secular position and mission. And behold, soon, they saw their hopes fulfilled beyond expectation already. At first, the French benevolence even poured in very pleasant and significant form over Western Germany: namely in the form of money consignments on the part of pope Clemens (who, for reasons of caution, chose the detour over "his" King Philipp). "From as early as 1305 onwards [the year of the election of the French national pope; K.], Philipp was seeking to form a French party amongst Western Germany's clerical and secular electors, and regularly paid annuities to a number of them." (He. VI, p 427)

Dogma and money! In the beginning of the 14th century, for decades long – only decades long? – these two heterogeneous terms manage to most closely blend together. On golden wings, so to speak, the dogma conquered itself the hearts in that century. Again, it was reserved for the French curia in Avignon to recognise the victorious value of money for the assertion of the dogma, and to practically exploit it: under Clemens' successor John already, the French curia had propelled itself to the first financial power in the world! And the smaller spirits (in Germany, too) very quickly learned from the big French brother. In Germany, especially Balduin of Trier (!) was a docile pupil in money affairs: "Barely anywhere in Germany of that time have the profits of the Jewish money men been more intensely utilised for the state treasury than in Trier."[30]

7. The French national dogma as a pan-folkish power

The French national church intervenes in European politics; the Parisian dogma crosses the national border and attempts, with partial success, to gain dominating influence in the separate churches of other nations. With this established statement, once before has this been highlighted, we have given all significant religious-clerical and secular-political events of the beginning 14th century the stamp of origin.

A monstrous abundance of power had been accumulated in the institution of the Gallic national church. This power naturally originated primarily from the fact that France's national church had understood how to secure the limitless support of the secular arm. From now on, for decades long in France – and also in the remaining countries – all "secular" politics was innervated from the side of the clerical-dogmatic sphere. (Thus, Europe's secular politics degenerated, and had itself, for centuries long, be alienated from its by God wanted, natural origin and purpose – unification and preservation of the volk!) From the 14th century on, in all of Europe, history turns into (open or veiled) church history.

In France's national church, three big systems formed one unity: *church – state – science* (this means theology and philosophy). This merged-together union cannot be named any better than with a term, which previously however, had only been in use for the end of the 14th century, namely the term *Gallicanism*[XIV]. And, to top it off, to dress the history of the entire 14th century in a formula: Gallicanism gradually morphed itself into *Romanism*. With the term Romanism, however, we have most accurately characterised the nature of the at the beginning of the 15th century constituted catholic universal church. Romanism is, so to speak, European or universal Gallicanism.

No human being will be able to understand the history of the 14th century and the beginning 15th century down to its last causality, if they have not recognised Gallicanism in its deep roots; and nobody will understand Gallicanism if they fail to see the crucial significance of the first third of its nature: science. Science in Gallicanism however, actually means theology (dogmatics) and philosophy; or, put differently: by Gallic science, one means Paris University. Who wants to understand history of the 14th century, must constantly keep their eye fixed on Paris University. Not the curia of the French national church in Avignon (let alone the Royal court in Paris), but the theological faculty of Paris University is the brain, from which the streams of will emanate, that determine and lead all that happens. Certainly, the "pope" to Avignon was officially chief of the national church, and in hierarchical-sacramental respect their leader and guide; but pope and hierarchy did not (not yet back then!) firmly stand on their own feet, they were much rather supported and controlled by a special institution: by Paris University! The French pope was dependant on the university as the weathercock is on the wind, as a plant on its culture medium. The curia may have constantly tried to emancipate itself, and it was depending on the relevant personality of the holder of the uppermost church

[XIV] = 'Frenchism' if you will.

authority, how well the process of emancipation succeeded, but equally constantly did the dominating influence of the Parisian theological faculty take effect.

In order to understand this "arrogance and presumption" of Paris University, of this "professorial clique", who "dared" sit court over the church and the pope; in order to understand this phenomenon – over which, still today, all church historians wonderingly shake their heads – we have to of course remember the real foundation and mission, we have to remember the true nature of this educational institution. We have to remember that this university, primarily, was no "educational institution" at all, and did not aspire to be one. In the framework of the university however, there was *also* lectures, and this educational side, with the years of the institution's existence, gained more and more significance; but, for the first few decades, why, for the entire century, the actual task of the masters and doctors lay in a different area. The university had constituted itself from the delegates of the French regional churches to become the legislative (dogma-giving) entity of France's to be implemented national church! Because *that* of course was the big task of the Parisian theologists: to *create* a uniform dogma, a uniform hierarchy and a national pope! Around the year 1300, there was of course no catholic universal church, no universal pope, and thus no catholic universal dogma! There was not even a national church with a national uniform dogma! *All that had to still be created in the first place*. In order to create a uniform dogma, and thus a national church, *for that reason*, Paris University has been brought to life. The theological faculty was meant to *create the dogma*: that was its first and foremost task. Because of this function, the university, for long decades, indeed remained the brain of the French national church, its actual life source. It could not have been any other way as that the pope to Avignon, in all important (theological-dogmatic and legislative) decisions, was depending on the interpretation of the Parisian father of the dogma. Because, well-remembered: no universal dogma and its curialistic interpretation existed yet! Augustin and Thomas of Aquin have emerged from the theological faculty of Paris University, and that *not* even right at the beginning of the 14th century! The university has not only proposed a few dogmatic doctrines, but it has also, in numerous commentaries, created the so important and difficult all-interpretation of the dogma[XV]; and something else important: it has simultaneously put both dogma and interpretation of the dogma onto a solid, "reasonable" basis, i.e. onto an ingenious philosophical system (scholastic divinity). All in one: Paris University was heart and brain of France's national church and of Gallicanism as such.

So, when in truth, things present themselves as just described, the trodden-out "history" of Paris University, for a large part, has to be a pack of lies, especially regarding formation and main objective of this institution. It axiomatically follows from the general fact alone, that before the 15th century, neither a

[XV] This setup reminds me of the 'Tora' a.k.a. 'Old Testament', being Jewish *written* law, which has, in the 'Talmud', received its all-interpretation as the *oral* law (although it has been fixed in writing numerous times, most notably in '1929-35', smack in the heart of National Socialist Germany, of all places, when Kammeier worked on *The Falsification of German History*, and is around 10.000 (!) blasted pages long). Sfti (Sorry for the interruption).

universal church, nor a universal dogma existed. Some readers will nonetheless welcome direct proof for the falsification; I will let it therefore follow.

Many professorships of the university were in the possession of Order slaves, the tradition reports. The priest Order, too, regularly employed masters from its own ranks in the institution's operation. Denifle has now subjected an old list of such masters of the order at Paris University from allegedly 1229 to 1360 to a critical examination, and brought some noteworthy things to light.[31]

The basis of this members' list stems from the Dominican Stephan de Salanhaco, the further editing from the well-known inquisitor Bernard Guidonis (and others). Naturally, the first specimen of the by Guidonis compiled list is lost! However, "chance" has left alive several copies, which we can thus neatly compare with each other. We turn directly to the main thing, by having Denifle confirm to us, as the finding of the script comparison, the most pursued falsification tactics – the deliberate contradiction! Naturally, have him unwittingly confirm, because the falsification has not with the smallest thought occurred to Denifle himself. So, the scripts show contradictions in the order of the masters' names! "Up to the 65th master, there is still sparse economising with the contradictions; but it is significant: the closer the authors of the list get to their own time, the more the information regarding the masters deviates. And finally, a downright Babylonian confusion sets in." (ibid, p 188/189) We rightfully expect greater accuracy, and eventually absolute unanimity, the more the list compilers approach the most recent past, and especially their back-then present time. However, we barely trust our eyes: the opposite is the case! The closer we get to the back-then present time, the more monstrous the confusion! From the year 1316 onwards, some scripts are "so most carelessly edited", that *arbitrarily*, in this or that script, *masters are missing or have been entered*. Also, there are "unexplainable *transpositions*" in the order of the names showing! So, thus looks the list of names of the theological doctors from the Dominican Order, who from 1229 onwards, have seen to their duties as teachers in the framework of Paris University, that is, have allegedly seen to their duties! Confronted with such lists with their "unexplainable" gaps and transpositions in the names, the historians stand before a riddle, on whose solution they have to despair from the start; because, surely, these lists are – according to their inherited opinion – authentic! Who in all the world, they shout, dumbfounded, could have had an interest to forge and invent such lists of names? Now, my readers know very well, that one could very well have had an interest in such lied-together lists of names of Parisian masters, quite an enormous interest even – that is, in the headquarters of the late medieval falsification action. This time, the forgers' burning interest referred to the "history" of Paris University, and this "history" desperately needed to be trimmed-to-fit. Therefore, also all the "records" of the university before 1400 are to be treated with the greatest mistrust (and even after 1400, not everything that shines "historically" is gold and historically authentic).

Paris University in its historically true form (as a dogma institute) has immensely contributed to the triumphant advance of France's national church and Gallicanism as such. Not least by the in Paris, in the dogmas' service, grown *theological philosophy* (scholastic divinity: a philosophy that has really originated in

the 'schola' as a community effort). If we disregard the tendency of its *mission*, and connected with this, its content, then, Paris University's scholastic divinity, in both its main denominations (realism and nominalism), formally-philosophically represents a miracle work of mental construction art. Such an artwork of thought had to blind and capture the spirits, and that not merely in France. With this, we touch on an important point; it concerns Paris University in its function as an *educational institution*. Almost from the first year of its foundation, and its dogmatic-philosophical work, the dogmatising and philosophising masters have also instructionally passed on and spread their new "science". By the nature of the affair, they were duty-bound to the teaching office, if else, their "science" of dogmatic and philosophical things should not die out with them! Of course, they did not profess their science for fondness or as a pastime, least of all, they professed it for the sake of "pure truth", but under the ban of quite a certain task and quite a certain final objective: in order to give France's to-be-implemented national church (and the already back then on the horizon appearing, desired universal church) a theologically and philosophically well-founded dogma. So, the office of teacher had simply been forced on the doctors by the purpose of their scientific works. Now, it is certain that not only the members of France's hierarchy were *obliged* to visit the university lectures, but that very soon, "foreign" students were also *admitted*. Was there a better way then, to blaze a trail for the French dogma beyond the national borders, than by gaining "students" from foreign nations? Later then, these pupils took Parisian theology and philosophy home with them; and when they, with the permission and the support of influential members of the regional priesthood, spread the Gallic spirit as teachers here, as has been the case in many places, they stood on an advanced post for France's national church. It could of course also happen that the foreign student, if they proved to be useful, moved up to the office of a doctor or master, and took care of a professorship.

Naturally, the dominating influence of the French national dogma most apparently emerged as a pan-folkish power in the area of clerical-secular *politics*. The election of Henry VII., the little "pensioner" of France's Philipp IV., the onehundred percent Frenchman by conviction, who honoured pope Clemens as a father, master and guide, was for the first time the most visible success of the for glorious deeds arming Gallicanism. And Henry of Luxemburg was elected unanimously, because he really, on not too deeply probing inspection, was able to appear as the potentially very welcome man of neutrality, as a ruler, who really seemed to stand *above* the parties. Since the Count of Luxemburg only possessed a small domestic force, the electors were all the more inclined to elect him, because his power and position as German King had to appear less threatening to them. The new King did indeed care little for the conditions in Germany, and proved to really be the clever ruler *above* the parties. Appease, balance, reconcile was his tactical parole, and telling is the general *public peace* that he had decreed for Germany in the year 1310 on the Imperial diet to Frankfurt. (What needs to be known about the significance of the general and particular public 'peaces', in the 14th and 15th century shooting like mushrooms out of the political soil, only the next Book can tell.)

But excuse me? Did the father and guide push his loyal protégé up the way to the German King's throne, so that the latter, once arrived on top, should rest upon his laurels? Little or nothing seemed to come out for the French national church from Henry's reign? Here however, the deception of the appearance is enormous. Especially to Henry VII. does Gallicanism (and bursting the cocoon from it, Romanism) owe most important services. Sure, regarding Germany, such merits remained rather hidden under the bright political surface for good reasons; they could nonetheless be achieved, that is, so to speak, the cold way. Henry only needed to utilise his Royal influence in a legislative manner, in order to energetically promote all sorts of privileges for the France-friendly "archbishops" and secular greats of Western Germany! However, Henry's work in the service of the French national church sticks out much clearer in the area of his *external* politics. Here, he served Gallicanism by creating the necessary advance posts for further successful struggles for the dogma union. The King established such advance posts in Italy and Bohemia.

The Bohemian success is of course plainly visible. Henry strove for, and achieved it, by winning over Bohemia for his House, and by strengthening the attainment for the future by the marriage of his son John with the Bohemia Princess Elisabeth. Thus, the Gallic influence had indeed only just achieved firm ground in the East of Germany, in the following time however – under the Gallic parson King Charles IV. – the significance of the Böhmen [Bohemia] possessions for the House of Luxemburg, and thus automatically for the dogmatic Christendom, should be of great consequence.

But what did the German King Henry IV. have to do with *Italy*? Well now, quite a lot!, the reader thinks, and they are reminded of the whole medieval "history" with the many army campaigns of German rulers to Italy, and especially to the world capital city Rome, where the German Kings have been crowned Emperor by the pope. After all, Italy belonged to the "Empire", so "history" announces. However, by remembering the medieval history, the reader immediately also remembers the general result of my critical investigations, which states, that the history of the Middle Ages, the way it is written in the sources today, at least up to the 14th century, is a predominantly fictionalised purpose novel. (Only from around the year 1300 onwards, it can be, with tight limitations, considered real history, albeit still pretty strongly falsified.) The reader remembers, that before the 15th century of course, a catholic universal church did not yet exist, and also, that before that date, no universal pope could have resided in the void by the Tiber, because a *town* Rome did not yet exist at all! Before this epoch, therefore, no German Kings could have [been] crowned "Roman" Emperor in the not existing christian capital city Rome!

Let us trustingly assume once that the medieval source tradition is real history: what made Henry VII. move across the Alps? We turn to the historians; what answer do they offer? There is one researcher who assures us: "When he [Henry VII.; K.] suddenly… found himself transferred to the first throne of the christian world, there had instantly awaken in his chivalrous, imaginative soul the thought of renewing the old tradition [of the "Empire"; K]… With all the fire of his nature he hung on to the ambition of the re-erection of the [allegedly for decades long defunct; K.] Emperordom." (V. I, p 3) So, a romantic idea has "instantly" nestled

down with Henry: he wanted to and he had to renew the long-time-gone Emperordom. And only on one condition could this happen: the King had to fetch himself the Emperor's crown from Italy, from Rome. "Lift up the Eagles!", he ordered, "on to Italy!" (V. I, p 69) Is it not noteworthy? The "Frenchman" on the German throne, of all people, takes the decision to refresh the faded, old Emperor's glory. This French pensioner and vassal, of all people, feels called upon to again force the way for *German* influence in Italy. And that at a time, when the conditions in Southerland [Italy] offered precious little attraction to a King even much more powerful than Henry. Namely, the back-then Italy was "torn bloody by parties" (as a pretty phrase in the history books goes); well, if we want to believe the source reports of Italian "contemporaries", then Italy in those decades had turned into a madhouse. "It seemed as if the almost wonderful abundance of vitality, which this country had to show, had forced it to suicidally tear itself to pieces." (V. I, p 9) But why then, for God's sake, this suicidal tearing itself to pieces? Because the "primeval" rivalry between the Ghibellines (supporters of the Emperordom) and the Guelphs (supporters of popedom) erupted with utmost violence again and again, the sources reply. But no, the historians reckon by referencing different source statements, "the longer the fight lasted, the more it removed itself from its original basis, the less were any relations to church or Emperordom perceptible with Guelphs and Ghibellines." (V. I, p 9) In brief, that means: regardless, on what the current opposition of two parties in a community in Italy was based, one gave itself the designation Ghibelline, the other the name Guelph! On closer inspection, some historians assure us, the Italian chaos appears "chiefly under the image of a class struggle, in which the democratic principle more and more reaches victory." (V. I, p 10) So, Italy had turned into a madhouse; and the chivalrous and imaginative Henry VII., of all people, thinks himself the by fate chosen man to pacify the suicidally tearing-itself-to-pieces Italian people. Because, yes, he wants to fetch himself the Imperial crown from Rome, but not as a party man does he want to appear beyond the Alps, but as peace-bearer, as reconciler of party opposites. "So, I, who is travelling along as the messenger and under the sign of pope Clemens (!), I am to appear here, in order to be willing towards the ones, and to betray the others? Not so!", does the contemporary Mussatus have the noble King Henry exclaim. (V. I, p 86) And Henry stormed off courageously, and "his credulity… plunged him almost with seeing eyes into the snares, which those [the Italian party chiefs, the city tyrants; K.] had laid out for him" – says Ferreto of Vicenza, another history-writing "contemporary". (V. I, p 393) At first, the King had smiling fortune walking directly on his side: all towns of Upper Italy cordially received the Royal visitor. When the Royal Italy traveller – he has supposedly set out on his journey with only 3000 men of war-folk – in a town, said to the Ghibellines and Guelphs: I ask [you], make up!, behold, the parties made up. Everywhere, the good Emperor guided back the for years banned party supporters, and these latter were pleased to take back in the previous opponents, so that Henry could soon write to the bishop of Strasbourg: reconciliation between Ghibellines and Guelphs all along![32] But suddenly, the tide turned, and something happened, that Henry (and his advisors and companions) could have anticipated. In Milan, a revolt occurred, which may have been beaten down, but worked as a signal to other towns. From the peace-bearer, Henry had to turn into a man of war, from the mediator into a party man. The King had to draw the sword against – the Guelphs! Because it

was them who revolted against Emperor and "Empire". By which it is proven, that the "old" party opposites (supporters of popedom, supporters of Emperordom) were still in effect at full strength yet. Under a strain, the King arrived at the luring objective of his longing, at the capital city of Christianity, at Rome. "History" announces, that here, he was then crowned Emperor by legates of the "universal pope" from Avignon.

It would be a waste of space to still further present to the reader the alleged fate of Emperor Henry VII. in Italy by means of the tradition. We no longer want to parrot falsified sources, but now set out to peel out historical factuality from the confused mass of the tradition. Henry's Italy journey, the way the sources present it to us, is a travel novel, in which only the acting persons are roughly historically authentic. Regarding the reported events, almost all are purposefully painted over and trimmed-to-measure, a large part is furthermore flat out invented. Invented are the alleged events in Rome, especially the Emperor's coronation, because before the 15th century of course, neither a town of Rome, nor a universal pope existed. And because the Roman events are *invented*, the fathers of the falsification action have not for example succeeded in getting it correct in every case with the compilation of the Knights' list, who had allegedly participated in the coronation ceremony. Because if we compare the list with the documents, it results in the striking fact, that the count of the participants in the list is incomplete. Thus, for example "the Duke of Bavaria, who, together with other Knights… returned back home… three weeks after the coronation, is not mentioned. No clerical man, no Italian is mentioned, although the Imperial documents yet count numerous prelates of both countries, and furthermore so many Italian men."[33] Here, once again, I have to admiringly highlight the clever caution of the falsification fathers. Because why, during the compilation of the list, was no name of an Italian man allowed to be listed? Simply because, with the *invented* chaos in Rome, just because it was a phantasy tale, one was unable to simply straight and clear determine: on *this* day (of the coronation), this and that Italian Knight (or cleric) has been present at the coronation festivities as a *temporary* supporter of the Emperor. If with *invented* events, not everything neatly fits in with each other, which is by nature all the more the case, the richer and livelier the novel is endowed, then, that will cause no trouble for as long as the fiction is openly marked as such. Different, if such fiction is passed off as authentic history. In that case, the word is to proceed carefully, and potentially play dumb, i.e. leave gaps. Now, with the fictionalisation of the coronation festivities in Rome, the difficulty of exactly specifying, who was present from the Italian side as the Emperor's supporter, was so exceedingly great, that Italian names were silenced, anyway. The difficulty lay in the fact, that of course the *taking sides* (for or against Henry, whether Ghibelline or Guelph) had to be invented. And with this sore point, we have touched on the critical central problem of the whole "history" of Henry's Italy journey.

The central problem is this: is the phenomenon of the party oppositeness, which faces us everywhere in Italy, correctly characterised with the confrontation Ghibelline – Guelph ? Can the deep split in the Italian people be understood historically correctly under the motto: here Emperor – there pope!? We get on the trail of the truth, when we ask ourselves: why then has the French national pope Clemens sent his "messenger" Henry across the Alps? What actually were Clemens' designs, that he sent "his loyal son" to Italy? Because –

and even the falsified tradition admits to that – pope Clemens was the real "instigator" of the Italian adventure! Henry VII. has merely acted as the tool of the French pope. "Henry's clerical conviction was plainly obvious… the pope and the mother church ruled over Henry's imagination." (Sch., p 223) Henry has supposedly sworn the holiest oaths to the pope – the sources announce – to not venture *against* the church, *but instead, to intervene everywhere with the utmost vigour against the* "*Heretics*". We halt here. Against which Heretics should the King act? Since at that time, no universal church existed yet, Henry could of course not take measures against "Heretics", who had "apostatised" the (non-existing) catholic universal church! Therefore, only genuine "Heretics" could be called in question, that means – just like in France and Germany – only the God-believing "Pagans" and the dogma-free Christians equally hostile opposed to any clerical organisation. With this statement now, we have also recognised the true character of the "party struggles" in Italy. In Italy as well, the with cunning, money and political violence advancing dogma worked as an inexhaustible source of discord. As in Germany, so in Italy, too, there were dogmatic regional churches that were planning to extend their power over the "church enemies". And as in Germany, so beyond the Alps, too, Gallicanism (pope Clemens) has gained a footing. The influence of the French national church must even have already been working quite successfully, because in Italy (at least in Upper Italy), the conditions for the advancement of Gallicanism had been particularly favourable. The ground had been pre-ploughed for the Gaelic seed. In connection with this, I do not perhaps think of the alleged clerical-stately possessions of universal popedom in Italy (Rome, church state), which the "Roman universal pope" had left behind over the "transfer" of his residence to Avignon, but supposedly, still had in his possession. The transfer of the universal-papal residence from Italy to Avignon is of course a lie! According to that, the French pope Clemens did not have the least entitlement to Rome or any other Italian possessions. Of what I think, when I talk of favourable pre-conditions for the Gallic idea in Italy, is the fact that back then, the member of a *French* House of rulers (Anjou) held the throne of Naples. (Since I will not go back to before the year 1300, the previous "history" of the House of Anjou remains disregarded in this Book.)

Robert of Anjou has naturally *not* received his inherited Kingdom as the allegedly universal-papal fief Empire from the hand of pope Clemens, the way "history" is trying to talk us into believing; but Robert was, by bonds of tradition and education, connected to France, his family's country of origin, and in Avignon, Clemens succeeded – certainly also with the clinking support [coins] of his papal chamber accountant – in harnessing him [Robert] for his [Clemens'] interests. Shortly before Henry's arrival in Italy, Robert, coming from pope Clemens, had, on his journey home into his Kingdom, successfully endeavoured making propaganda for the Gallic cause in Upper Italy. The task now, with which the German King had been entrusted by his father and guide Clemens, was to drive further with all energy the by Robert introduced Gallicanisation of Upper and Middle Italy. In *his* Kingdom, Robert was meant to be active for the cause of the French dogma. Italy was thus equally wedged stuck in a pair of Gallic pliers.

Henry VII. has come to Italy as the tool of the curia to Avignon, and his task and his plan were, to assert Gallicanism in Lombardy and Tuscany via political power. Even the falsified tradition admits to these facts of the case (in the sense that Henry was meant to be active for "pope and church" in Italy). Again, this is about the question for the root cause of Henry's Italy journey. All information of the sources, according to which the German King had supposedly travelled across the Alps, in order to fetch himself the Imperial crown in Rome (and to again refresh the "faded splendour of the Empire") is, in line with the general purpose of the falsification action, a pack of lies. Also, Henry has by no means been active as the man above the parties, as the peace-bearer and reconciler in Italy. He has much rather stood in a ferocious struggle with the opponents from the start. Who were his (and the pope's) opponents? We know it: his opponents were the "Heretics", i.e. the God-believers and free Christians, who wanted to know nothing of organised dogma religion and priesthood in Italy, either. Heretics and church Christians, that was the true signature of the Italian party oppositeness. In order to *correctly* use the traditional party names, we have to designate the Heretics Ghibellines, the dogmatic church Christians Guelphs.

Now, one will not fail to object: but after all, Henry has fought *against* the *Guelphs* (while the Empire-loyal Ghibellines were his supporters)! Then, that would mean, according to the just suggested name designation, that the had – fought against the church Christians. But that contradicts the fact that Henry's fight was pointed against the Heretics! Very true. However, the solution to this (seeming) dilemma is very simple to find. Consider the following: the history of Henry's Italy journey has been, for imperative reasons, totally falsified. The true meaning of the Royal intervention in Italy was not permitted to be illuminated by the fathers of the falsification action; in other words: *the true nature of the party oppositeness* was, in the purposefully painted over tradition, no longer permitted to shimmer through. For the forgers, it was: in for a penny, in for a pound. After the Italian adventure in the tradition had been re-forged in a way, that Henry wanted to renew the Empire, it was naturally impossible to have him draw the sword against his supporters, the ones loyal to the Empire, the Ghibellines! Even with history falsifications, one must be consequent. Thus, Emperor Henry, in the falsified tradition – not in real history! - had to fight against the Guelphs and against the pope. As an imaginary Emperor – in the bent-to-measure sources – he had no other choice at all. The above alleged dilemma solves itself, as we will see now, by the fact that the party designations Ghibellines-Guelphs are invented, and have been used arbitrarily. So, viewed historically-critically, our statement still stands: Henry has indeed fought against the church enemies (Heretics). He came across the Alps as the tool of the French national church. And it was necessary that he came, because Upper Italy's regional churches, in many places, were in an intense, open fight, and were depending on help.

The struggle was conducted by the parties with varying success. Even the church Princes did not win a decisive victory; but Henry VII. "never again saw home soil, but sank into an early grave under the noise of the arguing parties."[34] If the sources have to report to us, that towards the end of his life, Henry had supposedly been pushed into opposition against pope Clemens, then, there may well be a grain of truth in

these descriptions, because even previous good friends, going by experience, can part ways; we have to only avoid accepting literally cause and course of the parting ways, the way the sources describe them. Anything that does not support the general results, will have to be sieved out as falsified.

Under the title *The Formation of the Roman Universal Church*, the next book sets out to first describe the further attempts at assertion of the French national dogma (under Ludwig the Bavarian and Charles IV.), and then, the transformation of Gallicanism into Romanism.

Endnotes

[1] Historische Vierteljahresschrift [Historical Quarterly], 20. Annual, p 32

[2] L Pastor – Geschichte der Päpste [History of the Popes], Vol. 1, 1886, p 99/100 {in the text abbreviated P.}

[3] Hefele – Conciliengeschichte [History of the Councils], Vol. 2, 2nd Ed., p 664 {He.}

[4] Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichte [Messages of the Institute for Austrian History], Vol. XXI, 1900, p 607

[5] Christophe – Geschichte des Papsttums während des 14. Jahrhunderts [History of Popedom during…], Vol. 2, 1854, p 12/12

[6] F Gregorovius – Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter {History of the Town of Rome in the Middle Ages], Vol. VI, 1893, p 487

[7] R Jahr – Die Wahl Urbans VI. [The Election of…], Hallische Beiträge II [Hallisch Contributions] 1892, p 85

[8] M Rothbarth – Urban VI. und Neapel [… and Naples], Abhandlungen z. Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte [Treatises on Medieval and Modern History], Book 49, p 17

[9] A Harnack – Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte [School Book of Dogma History], Vol. III, 1890, p 413 {Ha.}

[10] H Ch Lea – Geschichte der Inquisition {History of the Inquisition], Vol. I, p 109 {L.}

[11] Historisches Jahrbuch [Historical Annual], Vol. IX, p 504

[12] A Hauck – Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands [Church History of Germany], Vol. V, 1st half, p 403, footnote 6 {H.}

[13] H Theloe – Die Ketzerverfolgungen im 11. und 12. Jahrh. [The Persecution of the Heretics in the 11th and 12th Century], Abhandlungen z. Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte [Treatises on Medieval and Modern History], Book 48, p 93

14 L Flathe – Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation [History of the Predecessors of the Reformation], Vol. I, p 310

[15] K Müller – Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen [The Waldensians and their individual Groups], p 90, footnote 2 {M.}

[16] Fr Thudichum – Papsttum und Reformation [Popedom and Reformation], 1903, p 90

[17] Fontes Rerum Germanicarum, Vol. IV, 1868, p 76

[18] Realencyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche [Real Encyclopedia for protestant Theology and Church], Vol. IV, 1898, p 743 {Re.}

[19] E Hirsch – Die Lage der Theologie [The Situation of Theology], "Deutsche Theologie", 1936, Book 2 and 3, p 53

[20] Th Lindner – Die Veme [The Vehme], 1888, p 474

[21] Hergenröthers Handbuch d allgem. Kirchengeschichte [Handbook of general Church History], Vol. III, 5. Ed., p 75

[22] Lexikon für Theology und Kirche [Encyclopedia for Theology and Church], 2nd Ed., Vol. III, p 528

[23] B Peters – Der Gottesbegriff Meister Eckharts [Master Eckhart's Notion of God], 1936, preface

[24] H Denifle – Die Entstehung der Universitäten im Mittelalter [The Origin of the Universities in the Middle Ages], 1885, p 91

[25] I B Schwab – Johannes Gerson, 1859, p 71

26 Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte [Studies and Descriptions from the realm of History], Vol. III, 1903, p 22

[27] L Loserth – Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters [History of the Later Middle Ages], Handbuch der Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte [Handbook of Medieval and Modern History], Section 2, Vol. IV, p 239 {Lo.}

[28] I Gmelin – Schuld oder Unschuld des Templerordens [Guilt or Innocence of the Templar Knight Order], 1893, p 132

[29] Geschichtsschreiber der Deutschen Vorzeit [History Writers of Prehistoric Germany], 14th Cent., Vol. I, p 86 {V}

[30] E Stengel – Baldewin von Luxemburg, Jahrbuch der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Rheinischen Geschichtsvereine [Yearbook of the Study Group of The Rhein History Clubs], Vol. II, 1936, p 24

[31] Archiv f. Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters [Archive for Literature and Church History of the Middle Ages], Vol. II, 1886, p 167 f.

[32] Regesta Imperii from 1246 to 1313, 1844, p 285

[33] Fr Schneider – Kaiser Heinrich VII. Vol. II, 1926, p 160 {Sch.}

[34] Th Lindner – Deutsche Geschichte unter den Habsburgern und Luxemburgern [German History under the Habsburgers and Luxemburgers], Vol. I, 1890, p 203